



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 6, 2021

No. 4

## House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SWALWELL).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
January 6, 2021.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ERIC SWALWELL to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

O God, our refuge and our strength, a very present help in times of discord and trouble. Mountains crumble, waters rage, nations roar, and yet we need not be afraid, for even now You abide with us in these times of great discord, uncertainty, and unrest.

We, who have pledged to defend our Constitution against all enemies, we pray Your hedge of protection around this Nation. Defend us from those adversaries, both foreign and domestic, outside these walls and perhaps within these Chambers, who sow seeds of acrimony to divide colleagues and conspire to undermine trust in Your divine authority over all things.

The journey of this experiment in democracy is perilous and demanding, fraught with anger and discontent. But wise rulers still seek You.

So help us, God, to find You in the midst of us.

So help us, God, to see Your gracious plan even in the events of these days.

So help us, God, to serve You and this Nation with Godliness and dignity.

We lay before You the gifts of our hopes, our dreams, our deliberations,

and our debates, that You would be revealed and exalted among the people.

We pray these things in the strength of Your holy name.

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 5(a)(1)(A) of House Resolution 8, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MANN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### APPOINTMENT OF TELLERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE TO COUNT ELECTORAL VOTES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, and the order of the House of January 4, 2021, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of two Members as tellers on the part of the House to count the electoral votes:

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN); and

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, January 5, 2021.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on January 5, 2021 at 5:05 p.m., said to contain a message from the President regarding additional steps addressing the threat posed by applications and other software developed or controlled by Chinese companies.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON,  
*Clerk of the House.*

### ADDRESSING THE THREAT POSED BY APPLICATIONS AND OTHER SOFTWARE DEVELOPED OR CONTROLLED BY CHINESE COMPANIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 117-6)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) (IEEPA), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), and section 301 of title 3, United States Code, I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order declaring additional steps to be taken concerning the national emergency with respect to the information and communications technology and services supply chain declared in Executive Order 13873 of May 15, 2019 (Securing the Information and Communications Technology and Services Supply Chain) to deal with the threat posed by applications and other

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H75

GOV  
Exhibit

511



software developed or controlled by Chinese companies.

The pace and pervasiveness of the spread in the United States of certain connected mobile and desktop applications and other software developed or controlled by persons in the People's Republic of China (PRC), to include Hong Kong and Macau (China), continue to threaten the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. By accessing personal electronic devices such as smartphones, tablets, and computers, Chinese connected software applications can access and capture vast swaths of information from users, including sensitive personally identifiable information and private information. The continuing activity of the PRC and the Chinese Communist Party to steal or otherwise obtain United States persons' data makes clear that there is an intent to use bulk data collection to advance China's economic and national security agenda. To deal with this threat, additional steps are required against those who develop or control certain Chinese connected software applications to protect our national security.

The Executive Order prohibits certain future transactions, as determined by the Secretary of Commerce (Secretary), involving the following Chinese connected software applications: Alipay, CamScanner, QQ Wallet, SHAREit, Tencent QQ, Vmate, WeChat Pay, and WPS Office. The Secretary is also directed to:

(i) continue to evaluate Chinese connected software applications that may pose an unacceptable risk to the national security, foreign policy, or economy of the United States, and to take appropriate action in accordance with Executive Order 13873; and

(ii) in consultation with the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence, provide a report to the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs with recommendations to prevent the sale or transfer of United States user data to, or access of such data by, foreign adversaries, including through the establishment of regulations and policies to identify, control, and license the export of such data.

I have delegated to the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General, the authority to take such actions, including adopting appropriate rules and regulations, and employing all other powers granted to the President by IEEPA, as may be necessary to implement the Executive Order. The heads of all executive departments and agencies are directed to take all appropriate measures within their authority to implement the provisions of the Executive Order.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

DONALD J. TRUMP.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 5, 2021.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 12:55 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1255

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. As the House comes to order for this important, historic meeting, let us be reminded that each side, House and Senate, Democrats and Republicans, each have 11 Members allowed to be present on the floor. Others may be in the gallery. This is at the guidance of the Attending Physician and the Sergeant at Arms.

The gentlemen on the Republican side of the aisle will please observe social distancing and the agreement to have 11 Members on each side so that we can honor the responsibility to this Chamber of this House of Representatives.

Please exit the floor if you do not have an assigned role from your leadership. You can share with your staff if you want to have a few more, but you cannot be that close together on the floor of the House with that many people in here.

I thank the Senate, and the Democrats and Republicans, for following the rules.

## COUNTING ELECTORAL VOTES—JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1

At 12:59 p.m., the Sergeant at Arms, Paul D. Irving, announced the Vice President and the Senate of the United States.

The Senate entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, headed by the Vice President and the Secretary of the Senate, the Members and officers of the House rising to receive them.

The Vice President took his seat as the Presiding Officer of the joint convention of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House occupying the chair on his left. Senators took seats to the right of the rostrum as prescribed by law.

The joint session was called to order by the Vice President.

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Vice President, parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The gentleman from Virginia will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Vice President, in order to follow the Speaker's instructions that only a limited number

of people be on the floor, may I ask how one would make an objection or make a parliamentary inquiry in the future if you are not on the floor but in the gallery.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under section 18 of title 3, United States Code, debate is not permitted in the joint session.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Further parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. Vice President, I am not attempting to debate. I am trying to find out how a parliamentary inquiry or a parliamentary point of order would be made in following with the Speaker's request that most of us not be on the floor. How do you make one of those points of order when you don't know what is going to happen later?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Respectfully, the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry constitutes debate, which is not permitted in the joint session under section 18 of title 3, United States Code.

Madam Speaker, Members of Congress, pursuant to the Constitution and the laws of the United States, the Senate and House of Representatives are meeting in joint session to verify the certificates and count the votes of the electors of the several States for President and Vice President of the United States.

After ascertainment has been had that the certificates are authentic and correct in form, the tellers will count and make a list of the votes cast by the electors of the several States.

The tellers on the part of the two Houses will take their places at the Clerk's desk.

The tellers, Mr. BLUNT and Ms. KLOBUCHAR on the part of the Senate, and Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois on the part of the House, took their places at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the tellers will dispense with the reading of the formal portions of the certificates.

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. After ascertaining that the certificates are regular in form and authentic, the tellers will announce the votes cast by the electors for each State, beginning with Alabama, which the Parliamentarians have advised me is the only certificate of vote from that State, and purports to be a return from the State, and that has annexed to it a certificate from an authority of that State purporting to appoint or ascertain electors.

Senator BLUNT. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Alabama seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Donald J. Trump of the State of Florida received 9 votes for President and MICHAEL R. PENCE of the State of Indiana received 9 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of vote of the State of Alabama that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?



There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from Alaska, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate from an authority of the State purporting to appoint and ascertain electors.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Alaska seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Donald J. Trump of the State of Florida received 3 votes for President and MICHAEL R. PENCE of the State of Indiana received 3 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of vote of the State of Alaska that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from Arizona, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote that the State purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate from an authority of that State purporting to appoint or ascertain electors.

Senator KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Arizona seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Joseph R. Biden, Jr., of the State of Delaware received 11 votes for President and KAMALA D. HARRIS of the State of California received 11 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of vote of the State of Arizona that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Vice President, I, PAUL GOSAR from Arizona, rise for myself and 60 of my colleagues to object to the counting of the electoral ballots from Arizona.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the objection in writing and signed by a Senator?

Mr. GOSAR. Yes, it is.

Senator CRUZ. It is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. An objection presented in writing and signed by both a Representative and a Senator complies with the law, chapter 1 of title 3, United States Code.

The Clerk will report the objection.

The Clerk read the objection as follows:

OBJECTION TO COUNTING THE ELECTORAL  
VOTES OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA

We, a Member of the House of Representatives and a United States Senator, object to the counting of the electoral votes of the State of Arizona on the ground that they were not, under all of the known circumstances, regularly given.

PAUL GOSAR,  
*Representative, State of Arizona.*  
TED CRUZ,  
*Senator, State of Texas.*

SENATORS

Mike Braun, John Kennedy, Ron Johnson, Steve Daines, James Lankford, Bill Hagerty, Marsha Blackburn.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mo Brooks AL-5, Andy Biggs AZ-5, Jim Jordan OH-4, Madison Cawthorn NC-11, Scott Perry PA-10, Mike Kelly PA-16, Clay Higgins LA-3, John W. Rose TN-6, Bill Posey FL-8, Jeff Duncan SC-3, Brian Babin TX-36, Louie Gohmert TX-1, Brian J. Mast FL-18, Warren Davidson OH-8, Andy Harris MD-1, Steven Palazzo MS-4, Doug Lamborn CO-5, Kat Cammack FL-3.

Tracey Mann KS-1, Bob Good VA-5, Adrian Smith NE-3, Billy Long MO-7, Jack Bergman MI-1, Michael Cloud TX-27, Rick Crawford AR-1, Roger Williams TX-25, Bob Gibbs OH-7, Russ Fulcher ID-1, Ted Budd NC-13, Barry Moore AL-2, Lee Zeldin NY-1, Jake LaTurner KS-2, David Rouzer NC-7, Jason Smith MO-8, Lauren Boebert CO-3, Chuck Fleischmann TN-3, Tim Burchett TN-2, Chris Jacobs NY-27.

Andrew S. Clyde GA-9, Lance Gooden TX-5, Diana Harshbarger TN-1, Mary E. Miller IL-15, Mark E. Green TN-7, Ron Estes KS-4, Neal Dunn FL-2, Ronny Jackson TX-13, Ralph Norman SC-5, Joe Wilson SC-2, Vicky Hartzler MO-4, Scott DesJarlais TN-4, Marjorie Taylor Greene GA-14, Doug LaMalfa CA-1, Jeff Van Drew NJ-2, Ben Cline VA-6, Michael D. Rogers AL-3, Markwayne Mullin OK-2, Pat Fallon TX-4, Randy K. Weber TX-14.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there further objections to the certificate from the State of Arizona?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The two Houses will withdraw from joint session. Each House will deliberate separately on the pending objection and report its decision back to the joint session.

The Senate will now retire to its Chamber.

The Senate retired to its Chamber.

□ 1315

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will remind Members of the need to adhere to the decorum requirements of the Chamber as laid out in the Speaker's announced policies of January 4, 2021, in accordance with the guidance of the Attending Physician.

Members are advised to remain in the Chamber only if they are participating in debate and must wear a mask at all times, even when under recognition for debate.

Members must also practice proper social distancing while present in the Chamber.

Please, in the interests of your own health and as an example to the American people, abide by the numbers, now up to 25 on each side of the aisle, to participate in this stage of the debate.

Pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 1 and 3 U.S.C. 17 governing the procedure for counting the electoral votes, when the two Houses withdraw from the joint session to count the electoral vote for separate consideration of objection, a Representative may speak to the objection for 5 minutes, and not more than once. Debate shall not exceed 2 hours, after which

the Chair will put the question, Shall the objection be agreed to?

The Clerk will report the objection made in the joint session.

The Clerk read the objection as follows:

OBJECTION TO COUNTING THE ELECTORAL  
VOTES OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA

We, a Member of the House of Representatives and a United States Senator, object to the counting of the electoral votes of the State of Arizona on the ground that they were not, under all of the known circumstances, regularly given.

PAUL GOSAR,  
*Representative, State of Arizona.*  
TED CRUZ,  
*Senator, State of Texas.*

SENATORS

Mike Braun, John Kennedy, Ron Johnson, Steve Daines, James Lankford, Bill Hagerty, Marsha Blackburn.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mo Brooks AL-5, Andy Biggs AZ-5, Jim Jordan OH-4, Madison Cawthorn NC-11, Scott Perry PA-10, Mike Kelly PA-16, Clay Higgins LA-3, John W. Rose TN-6, Bill Posey FL-8, Jeff Duncan SC-3, Brian Babin TX-36, Louie Gohmert TX-1, Brian J. Mast FL-18, Warren Davidson OH-8, Andy Harris MD-1, Steven Palazzo MS-4, Doug Lamborn CO-5, Kat Cammack FL-3.

Tracey Mann KS-1, Bob Good VA-5, Adrian Smith NE-3, Billy Long MO-7, Jack Bergman MI-1, Michael Cloud TX-27, Rick Crawford AR-1, Roger Williams TX-25, Bob Gibbs OH-7, Russ Fulcher ID-1, Ted Budd NC-13, Barry Moore AL-2, Lee Zeldin NY-1, Jake LaTurner KS-2, David Rouzer NC-7, Jason Smith MO-8, Lauren Boebert CO-3, Chuck Fleischmann TN-3, Tim Burchett TN-2, Chris Jacobs NY-27.

Andrew S. Clyde GA-9, Lance Gooden TX-5, Diana Harshbarger TN-1, Mary E. Miller IL-15, Mark E. Green TN-7, Ron Estes KS-4, Neal Dunn FL-2, Ronny Jackson TX-13, Ralph Norman SC-5, Joe Wilson SC-2, Vicky Hartzler MO-4, Scott DesJarlais TN-4, Marjorie Taylor Greene GA-14, Doug LaMalfa CA-1, Jeff Van Drew NJ-2, Ben Cline VA-6, Michael D. Rogers AL-3, Markwayne Mullin OK-2, Pat Fallon TX-4, Randy K. Weber TX-14.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will endeavor to alternate recognition between Members speaking in support of the objection and Members speaking in opposition to the objection.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to object to a number of States that did not follow the constitutional requirement for selecting electors.

Madam Speaker, this is something that is clear that our Founding Fathers debated about as a fundamental decision of how we choose our President. There was a lot of back and forth, if anyone reads the founding documents of our country, about the different versions they went through to ultimately come up with a process where each State has elections; each State has a process for selecting their electors and sending them to Washington.

Madam Speaker, in a number of those States, that constitutional process was not followed, and that is why we are here to object.

If you look at what the requirement says, nowhere in Article II, Section 1



does it give the secretary of state of a State that ability; nowhere does it give the Governor that ability; nowhere does it give a court that ability. It exclusively gives that ability to the legislatures. In fact, in most States, that is the process that was followed. But for those States, this wasn't followed.

Unfortunately, this is not new. We have seen over and over again more States where the Democratic Party has gone in and selectively gone around this process. That has to end, Madam Speaker. We have to follow the constitutional process.

Now, there might be reasons why some people don't like the process laid out by a legislative body.

Madam Speaker, I served on one of those legislative bodies when I was in the State legislature for 12 years. I served on the House and Governmental Affairs Committee, where we wrote the laws for our State's elections. And I can tell you, when we had to make changes, those were extensively negotiated. We would have people on both sides come.

Republicans and Democrats, Madam Speaker, would get together to work through those changes, any minute change to how a precinct would function, to how a change would be made in the time of an election, signature requirements, all the many things that involve a clerk carrying out the duties in each parish, in our case.

You would see people come and give testimony, Madam Speaker. Both sides could come. Clerks of court were there in the hearing rooms.

It was an open process, by the way, not behind closed doors in a smoke-filled room where somebody might want to bully a secretary of state to get a different version that might benefit them or their party or their candidate. That is not what our Founding Fathers said is the process. Maybe it is how some people wanted to carry it out. But they laid out that process.

So when we would have to make those changes, they were in public view; they were heavily debated; and then, ultimately, those laws were changed in advance of the election so everybody knew what the rules were. People on both sides knew how to play by the rules before the game started, not getting somewhere in the process and saying, well, you don't think it is going to benefit you, so you try to go around the Constitution.

That is not how our system works. It has gotten out of hand. So President Trump has called this out, and President Trump has stood up to it. So many of us have stood up to it.

In fact, over 100 of my colleagues, Madam Speaker, asked the Supreme Court to address this problem just a few weeks ago, and, unfortunately, the Court chose to punt. They didn't answer it one way or the other. They didn't want to get in the middle of this discussion.

We don't have that luxury today. We have to discuss this. We have to fix this.

In fact, on our first full day of this Congress, many of us brought legislation onto the House floor to start fixing the problems with our elections, to restore integrity to the election process, which has been lost by so many millions of Americans. And we had a vote. Every single Republican voted to reform the process. Every single Democrat voted against it. They don't want to fix this problem.

But the Constitution is our guide, and it is time we start following the Constitution. It is time we get back to what our Founding Fathers said is the process for selecting electors: that is the legislatures in public view, not behind closed doors, not smoke-filled rooms, not bullying somebody that might give you a better ruling.

Let's get back to rule of law and follow the Constitution, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) seek recognition?

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I rise to strike the last word.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, this day marks a crossroads for American democracy. Those who object to the counting of the electoral college votes, which reflect the votes of the American people, want to substitute their preferences for the voters' choice. That is not what our Constitution requires, and it is at odds with our American democratic Republic.

If Congress selects the next President instead of the American voters, we would have no need for an electoral college. In fact, we would have no need for Presidential elections at all. We would be moving from a government elected by the people to a government selected by those already governing.

That is not America. In the United States, we abide by the choices of the people, not by an elite few.

The Framers of our Constitution considered to have Congress select the President and specifically rejected it. Instead, they wrote Article II and the 12th Amendment.

Article II creates the electoral college, where each State appoints electors. Laws of all 50 States and D.C. require electors to vote for the winner of the State's popular election. Each State provides for the orderly conduct of elections, including lawful challenges, recounts, and the like.

The 12th Amendment is what brings us to today. It says the electors meet in their States. That happened December 14.

The amendment says the electors shall cast their votes, sign and certify them, and transmit them to us, sealed. That has been done. The sealed envelopes containing the signed and certified ballots from each State's electors reflecting the votes of the people are in those mahogany boxes.

The 12th Amendment directs the Vice President, as the President of the Sen-

ate, to do only this: open the sealed envelopes and then the votes shall be counted. Simple. It doesn't say counted in a manner that some Members of Congress or the Vice President might prefer. No. The votes are simply to be counted as certified and transmitted by the States.

□ 1130

During reconstruction after the Civil War, more than one slate of electors were appointed by States. Dueling lists were sent and protracted processes were undertaken in Presidential elections. And, as a result, to make an orderly process, Congress enacted the Electoral Count Act of 1887. This law governs our proceedings today. The act provides dispute resolution mechanisms.

Under the ECA, if a Governor certifies a slate of electors and there are no competing slates in that State, the Governor-certified must be counted. Today, every single slate of electors won by Joe Biden, or won by Donald Trump, got their Governor's certification. Not a single State submitted a competing slate. There is no dispute to resolve.

The 2020 election was the most secure election conducted in modern history. Challenges were resolved by lawful recounts and audits.

The result?

Vice President Biden won the 2020 election.

More than 60 lawsuits were filed contesting elements of the election process. None of these lawsuits prevailed.

Why?

As even President Trump's own judicial appointees ruled, there was no evidence of any wrongdoing that would change the outcome.

The people spoke. It was not a close election. The margin of victory for Biden in 2020 was larger than Trump's margin in 2016. In fact, the Biden victory is one of the most decisive in modern times, exceeding the margin enjoyed by Reagan when he defeated Carter in 1980.

Congress has gathered in a joint session to count electoral votes every four years since 1789. I understand the disappointment people feel when their candidate for President loses. I have felt the same several times in my voting life.

When that happens, it is not an invitation to upend the Constitution and the laws of the United States. It is an invitation to work with the new President for the good of the country and to wait for the next election in 4 years if you are dissatisfied.

In that spirit, I urge my colleagues to uphold the American democracy and reject the objection.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, Americans instinctively know there was something wrong with this election. During the campaign, Vice President Biden would do an event and he

would get 50 people at the event. President Trump, at just one rally, gets 50,000 people. President Trump increases votes with African Americans; increases votes with Hispanic Americans; won 19 of 20 bellwether counties; won Ohio by 8; Iowa by 8; and Florida by 3. President Trump got 11 million more votes than he did in 2016, and House Republicans won 27 of 27 toss-up races.

But somehow the guy who never left his house wins the election?

Eighty million Americans, 80 million of our fellow citizens, Republicans and Democrats, have doubts about this election; and 60 million people, 60 million Americans think it was stolen.

But Democrats say: No problem. No worries. Everything is fine.

We asked for an investigation. We asked Chairman NADLER, Chairwoman MALONEY for an investigation. They said no. They wouldn't want to investigate something that half the electorate has doubts about. It is just the Presidency of the United States.

Why? Why not one single investigation? Why not even one single hearing over the last 9 weeks in the United States House of Representatives? Why?

Because all the Democrats care about is making sure President Trump isn't President. For 4½ years that is all they have cared about.

July 31, 2016, before he was elected the first time, Jim Comey's FBI takes out the insurance policy; opens an investigation on the President based on nothing.

May 17, 2017, Bob Mueller was named special counsel. Two years they investigate the Russia hoax. Nineteen lawyers, 40 agents and \$40 million of taxpayer money for nothing.

December 18, 2019, Democrat House Members vote to impeach President Trump based on an anonymous whistleblower with no firsthand knowledge, who was biased against the President and who worked for Joe Biden.

But none of that worked. As hard as they tried, none of that worked. They threw everything they had at him.

So what did they do next?

They changed the rules. They changed the election law and they did it in an unconstitutional fashion, and that is what we are going to show over the next several hours of debate.

The Constitution is clear, as Whip SCALISE just said. State legislatures and only State legislatures set election law.

In Arizona, the law says voter registration ends on October 5.

Democrats said: We don't care what the law says.

They went to a court, got an Obama-appointed judge to extend it 18 days. No debate, as Steve talked about. No debate. No discussion. They just did it.

Pennsylvania, same thing. Pennsylvania laws says mail-in ballots have to be in by 8 p.m. election day.

Democrat Supreme Court said: Nope. We are going to extend it.

Election day doesn't end on Tuesday now. They took it to Friday. Extended

the election 3 days; not the legislature, the partisan Supreme Court.

Pennsylvania law says mail-in ballots require signature verification.

Democrat secretary of state said: Nope. I am going to decide by myself that it doesn't, for 2.6 million ballots.

Pennsylvania law says mail-in ballots can't be processed until election day. Some counties said no. And you can imagine which counties they were. Democrat-run counties said no and allowed ballots to be cured and fixed before election day.

They did an end-run around the Constitution in every State that Republicans will object to today. Every single one. It was a pattern. It was their template. They did it in Arizona. They did it in Georgia. They did it in Michigan. They did it in Pennsylvania. They did it in Nevada. They did it in Wisconsin.

Yet, some of our Members say: Don't worry about it. We shouldn't do anything. Just let it go. It was just six States who violated the Constitution.

What if it is 10 States next time? What if it is 15? What if, in 2024, 2028, it is 26 States? What if it is half the States that do an end-run around what the Constitution clearly spells out?

We are the final check and balance. The authority rests with us, the United States Congress, the body closest to the American people, right where the Founders wanted it. We should do our duty. We should object to and vote for this objection to the Arizona electors.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, a little more than 2 months ago, America performed an extraordinary feat. Under some of the most trying circumstances in our history, our fellow citizens conducted a free and fair election, vindicating our Founders' belief once again, that we were capable of self government and a peaceful transition of power.

On November 3, the American people chose Joe Biden to be their next President by an enormous margin. The successful conduct of that election, among the most secure in American history, was not an accident. It was the result of the dedicated work of thousands of volunteers, canvassers, poll workers, electors, and State and local election officials.

When the conduct of any State election was challenged, the courts, through judges appointed by Democrats and those appointed by Republicans, heard unsubstantiated claims of fraud, found they had no merit, and said so.

But most important, the American people persevered. In the midst of the worst pandemic in a century, America had one of the most impressive elections in a century, with historic voter turnout.

Our fellow citizens did their civic duty. The question we face today is: Will we do ours?

That we are here, with a substantial number of our Members seeking to overturn an election is remarkable, tragic, and all too predictable, for it is the natural result of a locomotive set in motion months ago with a myth. For weeks and weeks, before, during, and after our election, a dangerous falsehood was propagated: That our election would be marred by massive fraud.

Never mind it was the same election which brought the very men and women to this Chamber who would challenge its results. What value has consistency when measured against ambition?

A former Senator from Georgia, remarking on a contested election over a century ago, said: "Able men, learned men, distinguished men, great men in the eyes of the nation, seemed intent only on accomplishing a party triumph, without regard to the consequences to the country. That is human nature. That is," he said, "unfortunately, party nature."

Was he right?

We stand in a House which was once the place of giants. Have we become so small? Does our oath to uphold the Constitution, taken just days ago, mean so very little?

I think not. I believe, to quote our dear departed friend, Elijah Cummings, that we are better than that. I think Elijah would be proud that the debate here today is not between Democrats and Republicans, and that some Republicans, including the Republican leader of the Senate, remain devoted to the principle that we are a nation of laws, not individuals, let alone a single individual.

It may seem unfair to the new Members who have only just taken the oath for the first time, that they should be so soon tested with one of the most consequential votes they may cast, no matter how long they serve. But it is so, and none of us can shrink from that responsibility. Nor can we console ourselves with the intoxicating fiction that we can break that oath without consequence because doing so will not succeed in overturning the election. An oath is no less broken when the breaking fails to achieve its end.

We must be mindful that any who seek to overturn an election will do injury to our Constitution, whatever the result. For just as the propagation of that dangerous myth about this election made this moment inevitable, our actions today will put another train in motion. This election will not be overturned.

But what about the next? Or the one after that?

What shall we say when our democratic legacy is no more substantial than the air, except that we brought trouble to our own house and inherited the wind?

This isn't the first time we have had a contentious election, and it won't be the last. In 1800, John Adams lost a closely contested election to Thomas

Jefferson, in the first peaceful transition of power from one party to another in our history. Adams was hardly pleased with the result, choosing to skip the inaugural activities, but he did what leaders are required to do in a democratic government when they lose. He went home. He went home.

Jefferson would later refer to his victory as the Revolution of 1800, but marveled that the Revolution had occurred "by the rational and peaceful instruments of reform, the suffrage of the people."

It has never been our place to overturn an election, and if we hope to remain a democracy, it never will be.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I join the objection to counting votes of electors from my home State of Arizona, as well as Georgia, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Michigan, and Nevada, because election integrity is the heart of our American constitutional republic?

In a representative form of government, we must be able to trust that our elections accurately represent the will of the American voter. This is the appropriate forum anticipated and provided for by our Founders to debate whether this election complied with the Constitution that we have all sworn to protect.

Every particular of the Constitution is to be protected, including Article II, Section 1. The debate as to the legitimacy of the 2020 Presidential election has been suppressed by the left and its propagandists in the media until today.

State legislatures are required to determine the manner in which electors are chosen. Arizona names its electors on the general election ballot and identifies what candidate those electors are required to vote for should that candidate obtain the majority of votes in the general election.

As part of the manner for determining electors, Arizona also establishes deadlines for voter registration. The deadline has been in place for 30 years.

□ 1345

This year, that voter registration deadline was October 5. Early voting commenced 2 days later. Five days before the deadline, a group filed a lawsuit demanding that Arizona election officials not enforce the deadline.

The Federal District Court decided that since other States have a deadline later than Arizona's and some even allow for registration when voting, that Arizona's new deadline would be a time he chose, not the legislature's timeline.

The appellate court effectively overturned the lower court ruling and noted that the Arizona deadline established by the State legislature was sound and appropriate and complied with the Constitution. But the appellate court merely shortened the extension,

the bypassing of the deadline to 10 days.

The appellate court, without legal justification, also decided that everyone who registered after the legal deadline, but before the deadline created by judicial fiat, could still vote.

Note that the Arizona legislature was no longer in control of determining the manner of appointing Presidential electors because the court had set a new deadline, even though the appellate court found the legislature's deadline was constitutionally sound.

During that window, more than 32,000 voters registered in Maricopa County alone. Here are copies of those voter registration records. In going around the deadline set by the legislature, the court ignored the Arizona legislature's obligation and right to direct the manner of choosing Presidential electors as set forth in Article II, Section 1.

As a consequence of that judicial usurpation, more than 32,000 people were allowed to unlawfully cast ballots in Arizona's Presidential election in 2020.

The Arizona legislature seeks an independent audit of the election. The Governor refuses now to call them into a special session. The Maricopa County Board of Supervisors has refused to comply with legislative subpoenas. In Arizona, the people who control the evidence related to the election have done everything possible to prevent an independent audit directed by the legislature.

Arizonans have used the limited amount of records available to investigate the 2020 Presidential election. Of a limited sample of 1,000 addresses of voters, they found 539 voters did not live at the addresses on the voter rolls. Here is a stack of 1,000 declaration of affidavits supporting that.

I object to counting the votes of Arizona electors because the Federal courts went around the legislatively constructed mechanism for choosing Arizona's Presidential electors, allowing tens of thousands of voters to unlawfully cast votes. The court usurped a key component of the Arizona legislature's manner of selecting Presidential electors, thus violating Article II, Section 1. The legislature is being obstructed in its efforts. And what little evidence we have and what little information we have has produced this kind of evidence, which indicates a significant problem with the integrity of the Presidential election.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD my written comments, together with the voter registration records that reflect the 32,000 registrations permitted in contravention of State law; letters and resolutions from Arizona legislators pertaining to the count of votes from electors; along with approximately 1,000 affidavits and declarations pertaining to potential voter fraud in Arizona in the 2020 Presidential election; and the statement of Congressman RANDY WEBER of Texas.

DECEMBER 31, 2020.

DEAR VICE PRESIDENT PENCE: As the Chairwoman of the Arizona House Elections Com-

mittee, I write to you with upmost urgency to communicate to you several occurrences that thwart our ability as legislators to investigate legitimate and concerning allegations of election fraud in the most recent general election. On December 14, 2020, Arizona sent an alternate slate of electors, along with a resolution from 21 current and 8 newly elected legislators asking you to refrain from accepting the Biden electors until we could adequately investigate these claims of fraud.

Soon after the election, I requested an Elections Committee discovery hearing in order to use subpoena power to acquire the voting machines and ballots in order to do a comprehensive and forensic audit. I was told that it was not a good idea and was denied the ability. I continued to request the hearing with the Speaker of the House, asked publicly, and tried every avenue to no avail. A full month later on December 9th, the Senate President authorized a hearing via the Judiciary committee, and that did result in subpoenas to the Maricopa County Supervisors (who oversee the elections process) that have yet, as of the writing of this letter, been complied with.

Court cases have been dismissed due to not having evidence, however our efforts to do an audit to obtain such evidence have been suppressed. We held a hearing on 11/30/2020 with Rudy Giuliani to at least hear testimony from citizens who experienced irregularities, along with subject matter experts who reported severe irregularities and probable tampering with the machine apparatus. On 11/30/2020, a group of Arizona citizens reported publicly that they had uncovered with great confidence a minimum estimation of 160,000 fraudulent voters, based on over 1000 declarations/affidavits collected. This supports an earlier document submitted to the Attorney General and would largely impact the outcome of the election.

We have experienced obstruction at every turn. For your reference, I have itemized, in Exhibit A, many of the various ways we have been stopped from investigating claims of fraud and gross irregularities. It is my hope that you will see that the Arizona Presidential election is still in dispute and unresolved. We call on you to take this into consideration as you perform your duties on January 6th, and not accept the electors until we have resolution to these matters.

With utmost respect,

KELLY J. TOWNSEND,  
Senator-Elect.

#### EXHIBIT A

1. Requests from the House Elections Chairwoman (myself) and the House Federal Relations Chairman (Mark Finchem) to hold an evidentiary hearing were repeatedly denied and have yet to be honored. Multiple Chairmen of various committees requested a hearing in order to investigate claims, to no avail. We were forced to hold an unofficial hearing on November 30th where many came forward with very concerning evidence and claims.

2. The Senate Judiciary Committee hearing was not held until 41 days after the election on 12/14/2020, the same day as the Electors were to cast their votes. This delay rendered the hearing of little effect regarding having confidence in the correct votes cast. The Chairman thus issued a subpoena for the equipment and ballots, but the Maricopa Board of Supervisors has countersued and refuse to comply. They will not release any machine or ballot info, even though within the RFP for the Dominion machines, it is stated that their key features are their ability to conduct hand counts, perform risk limiting audits, and publish ballot images and adjudication records with markings on a



public website, calling it their open data initiative. Now that they are being asked for it, they are refusing to make it available, citing voter confidentiality. There is no voter information contained in the machine or on a ballot, however, so that reasoning is insufficient. Their inaction and nonfeasance prevent us from proper discovery.

3. I, along with several others, requested the Governor to call us in for special session to be able to deal with the issue. It is our understanding that we cannot enforce the subpoena for equipment and ballots unless we are in session. His ongoing unwillingness to call us into session to address these issues had kept us from adequate discovery. On 12/02/2020, Governor Doug Ducey was asked by the media if he was going to honor the Legislature's request for a special session. He proceeded to incorrectly name Monday January 13th as our first day back in regular session. In response, the reporter asked, "So you see no need for a special session to look at any of these issues or the issue of Presidential electors..." to which the Governor interrupted and said, "I'll see the Legislature in January."

4. The House leadership attempted to deter Representative Bret Roberts from sending a letter to Attorney General Brnovich and the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors regarding the accurate performance of a hand count based on the statutory requirement to do so by precinct, versus vote center. By doing a hand count based on voting centers, it renders it impossible to tell if there was a rogue precinct involved in fraud. Nevertheless, Rep. Robert's efforts to enforce statute were thwarted by House leadership.

5. One week prior to the Electors voting, on December 7th, the House and Senate leadership closed the buildings in the name of COVID-19, preventing any in-person hearings or work to be performed. This greatly hindered our ability to push for discovery regarding election integrity during the last days before the Elector's votes were cast.

6. The Maricopa County Board of Supervisors held a closed meeting on 11/20/2020 in order to certify the election results, where the public was not allowed to participate and ask questions. Prior to that meeting, on 12/08/2020, Merissa Hamilton (a data integrity expert) delivered to the Attorney General a statistically significant listing of deceased voters that received a ballot and those deceased who actually returned a ballot. At the aforementioned meeting, the Maricopa County Elections Director Ray Valenzuela stated that the list of deceased voters casting a ballot was mere folklore and dismissed it as a nonissue. This accusation is still pending an investigation.

7. After submitting a public records request for the Federal only voters who cast a ballot in the 2020 General election, I was told by a staff member that the Elections Director was "vetting the list" before he gave it to me. I did not request a cleaned-up list of voters, but the list in its entirety. This diminished my confidence in that list, that I have a true representation of persons who cast a ballot that cannot establish their identity or citizenship.

8. Arizona State House leadership prevented Legislators from issuing press releases having to do with the election that did not conform to their own opinion. This diminished our ability to communicate to the public our concerns about how the election and post procedures were being handled.

9. On 12/01/2020, I requested the Attorney General's Elections Integrity office to investigate the claims made at the November 30th Giuliani hearing and provided them the link. I was told that none of the items listed at the Giuliani hearing would be investigated by that office.

10. The Maricopa County Recorder attended more than one DefCon conference that focused on the ability to hack voting machines. The Legislature was never informed that the outcome of these conferences recommended that elected officials be notified due to unprotected ports on the machines, passwords left unset or left in default configurations and security features of the underlying commercial hardware were left unused or even disabled. It was recommended that to improve election security, paper ballots should be used, and a rigorous post-election audit be performed. We learned about this issue via social media, and it was obfuscated by the Election officials.

11. Arizona Republican State Chair Kelli Ward reports the following malfeasance and obstruction:

a. No allowed review of the digitally adjudicated ballots—over 200,000.

b. Only 100 of the duplicated ballots reviewed—3% error rate in favor of President Trump. Maricopa County refused to look at the other 28,000 ballots.

c. No meaningful signature verification. County employees doing signature verification offsite, over the internet, without oversight, and at times at a rate of 30 signatures or more per minute.

12. The Secretary of State took 24 days to answer a public records request by Merissa Hamilton, asking them to deliver the meeting minutes from their technical committee to certify the Dominion voting equipment. Only after four requests and the involvement of the Ombudsman did she obtain the information. The results of that request showed that despite the voting equipment not being able to calculate the votes properly, which was never addressed, the machines were still certified. The Maricopa County RFP for the Dominion equipment did not give the public a chance to give input on the procurement. There was never any discussion or an offer of various options to choose from. The Board of Supervisors went straight to a vote with no discussion and approved the machines unanimously.

13. There are multiple/numerous examples of how on election day observers and poll workers were prevented from overseeing the various procedures, thereby undermining confidence that there was no illegal activity and violating Arizona's statutes regarding election integrity. We have had no formal investigation into the vast majority of these accusations.

#### SUMMARY

Arizona has many unresolved issues that we would like to have investigated in order to confidently say our electors voted for the true victor in the 2020 Presidential election. We still have outstanding issues left unresolved and are being stopped at nearly every turn from investigating. For example, the Maricopa County Recorder's office started counting early ballots 14 days before election day. During that time, the backup server was removed each night by a Dominion employee. This is of significant concern because the information on those servers could have been manipulated and/or provided to nefarious people as to how many ballots/votes were needed to change the results of the election as time went on.

Many in the Legislature believe that if we are able to do a forensic audit, we could investigate these and other serious claims brought forward to us. However, as you can see by the list above (not exhaustive but brief for your benefit) we have many entities who appear to be blocking our efforts to get to the bottom of the issue. One can only ask, in a supposedly secure and fair election, why discovery is being quashed.

#### CONCLUSION

It is asked that all of these issues be considered when contemplating the eleven Ari-

zona electoral votes. Our election is still in dispute, and we have obfuscation and attempts at running out the clock to prevent discovery of the facts. We believe it is impossible to conclusively declare a winner in Arizona and pray that you would refrain from counting the electoral votes from our state, and consider the alternate slate should we be able to establish validity to the various claims of election fraud on such a scale that would change the outcome.

Thank you, kindly, for your attention to these matters.

#### A RESOLUTION TO CONGRESS

Whereas, it is the constitutional and legal obligation of the Legislature of the State of Arizona to ensure that the state's presidential electors truly represent the will of the voters of Arizona; and

Whereas, pursuant to the direction of Congress as set forth in United States Code, title 3, section 1 as authorized by Article II, section 1, clause 4 of the Constitution of the United States, and state law adopted pursuant thereto, Arizona conducted an election for presidential electors on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November of 2020—that is, on November 3, 2020; and

Whereas, that election was marred by irregularities so significant as to render it highly doubtful whether the certified results accurately represent the will of the voters; and

Whereas, Congress has further directed in U.S. Code, title 3, section 2 that when a state "has held an election for the purpose of choosing electors, and has failed to make a choice on the day prescribed by law, the electors may be appointed on a subsequent day in such manner as the legislature of such State may direct"; and

Whereas, that provision implicitly recognizes that Article II, Section 1, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution grants to each state legislature, with stated limitations, the sole authority to prescribe the manner of appointing electors for that state; and

Whereas, the United States Supreme Court and other courts have explained that when a state legislature directs the manner of appointing electors, it does so pursuant to a grant of authority from the U.S. Constitution rather than by reason of any state constitutional or other legal provision; that this authority may be exercised by the legislature alone without other aspects of the normal lawmaking process; and that the state legislature's authority over the appointment of presidential electors is plenary and may be resumed at any time; and

Whereas, because U.S. Code, title 3, section 7 mandates that all presidential electors vote for President and Vice President of the United States on December 14, 2020, it is impossible to pursue the Legislature's preferred course of action, which would be for Arizona's voters to participate in a new and fair and free presidential election before that date; and

Whereas, in view of the facts heretofore recited, the Legislature is required to exercise its best judgment as to which slate of electors the voters prefer; and

Whereas, legal precedent exists where in 1960 the State of Hawaii sent an alternate slate of electors while the Presidential election was still in question in order to meet the deadline of selecting electors, and upon recount the alternate slate of electors' ballots were ultimately counted; and

Whereas, the undersigned have an obligation to find the truth. For this reason, on several occasions since November 3, we state lawmakers have requested fact-finding hearings to include a comprehensive and independent forensic audit. At this time, no such

audit has been authorized. This leaves the uncertainty of the election results in a state that requires further investigation and resolution; and

Whereas, ongoing election irregularity litigation is currently active, and there are unresolved disputes by both the Legislature and at least one Presidential campaign, rendering the election inconclusive as of date of signing of this letter,

Therefore, be it

*Resolved* by the undersigned Legislators, members of the Arizona House and Senate, request that the alternate 11 electoral votes be accepted for to Donald J. Trump or to have all electoral votes nullified completely until a full forensic audit can be conducted. Be it further resolved that the United States Congress is not to consider a slate of electors from the State of Arizona until the Legislature deems the election to be final and all irregularities resolved.

Signed this day, 14 December, 2020.

Senator Elect Kelly Townsend, Legislative District 16; Representative Kevin Payne, Legislative District 21; Representative Mark Finchem, Legislative District 11; Senator Sonny Borrelli, Legislative District 5; Representative Bret Roberts, Legislative District 11; Representative Bob Thorpe, Legislative District 6; Senator David Farnsworth, Legislative District 16; Representative Leo Blasiucci, Legislative District 5; Representative Anthony Kern, Legislative District 20; Senator Sylvia Allen, Legislative District 15; Senator Elect Nancy Barto, Legislative District 15; Majority Leader Warren Petersen, Legislative District 12; Representative Steve Pierce, Legislative District 1; Representative Tony Rivero, Legislative District 21; Senator David Gowan, Legislative District 14; Representative David Cook, Legislative District 8; Representative John Fillmore, Legislative District 16; Representative Travis Grantham, Legislative District 12; Representative Walter Blackman, Legislative District 6; Representative Shawwna Bolick, Legislative District 20; Representative Noel Campbell, Legislative District 1; Representative Elect Jacqueline Parker, Legislative District 16; Representative Elect Beverly Fingerelli, Legislative District 21; Representative Elect Jake Hoffman, Legislative District 12; Senator Elect Wendy Rogers, Lt Col, USAF (ret), Legislative District 6; Representative Elect Steve Kaiser, Legislative District 15; Representative Elect Brenda Barton, Legislative District 6; Representative Elect Joseph Chaplik, Legislative District 23; Representative Elect Judy Burges, Legislative District 1; Representative Elect Quang Nguyen, Legislative District 1.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I thank you first and all my dear beloved colleagues for your love and tenderness, which my family and I will never forget.

Abraham Lincoln, whose name is a comfort to us all, said: "We have got the best government the world ever knew."

It is best because the first three words of the Constitution tell us who governs here: We the People.

Watch this proceeding today and tell the world with pride, as Lincoln did, about the brilliant meaning and promise of our country. Our Government belongs to the people.

As President Ford said: Here the people rule.

Today we are in the people's House to complete the people's process for choosing the people's President. We assemble into joint session for a solemn purpose that we have all sworn a sacred oath to faithfully discharge. The 12th Amendment obligates each and every one of us to count the electoral votes to recognize the will of the people in the 2020 Presidential election.

We are not here, Madam Speaker, to vote for the candidate we want. We are here to recognize the candidate the people actually voted for in the States.

Madam Speaker, the 2020 election is over and the people have spoken. Joe Biden received more than 80 million votes. Seven million more than President Trump. A number larger than any other President has received in U.S. history. The sweeping popular victory translated into an electoral college victory of 306-232, a margin which President Trump pronounced a landslide when he won by those exact same numbers in 2016.

So now we count the electoral votes that were just delivered to us in the beautiful mahogany cases brought by those hardworking Senate pages. These mahogany cases contain only the 538 electoral votes that were sent in by the States, not the 159 million ballots that were cast by our constituents. Those were counted 2 months ago by hundreds of thousands of election officials and poll workers across America who risked their health and even their lives in the time of COVID to deliver what our Department of Homeland Security called the most secure election in American history. Many of these officials have endured threats of retribution, violence, and even death just for doing their jobs.

Just as the popular vote was for Biden, so was the electoral vote. On December 15, Senate Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL recognized it. "The electoral college has spoken," the Senator said from the Senate floor. "Today I want to congratulate President-elect Joe Biden."

Yet, we have seen escalating attacks on our election with unfounded claims of fraud and corruption. More than 60 lawsuits have been brought to date seeking to overturn the results. They have failed repeatedly and they have failed spectacularly.

Every objection we hear today maligning our States and their officials—both Republican and Democrat—has been litigated, adjudicated, and obliterated in both Federal and State Courts. The President has not just had his day in court, Madam Speaker, he has had more than 2 months in court looking for a judge to embrace these arguments. In more than 50 cases, Madam Speaker, at least 88 different judges, including many appointed by the President himself, have meticulously rejected the President's claims of fraud and corruption.

Take Georgia U.S. District Court Judge Steven Grimmer, who was named to the bench by President

Trump last year. He rejected President Trump's prayer to block certification of Biden's victory in Georgia, saying it "has no basis in fact or law."

Take U.S. District Judge Brett Ludwig, another Trump nominee who took the bench in September. He dismissed a lawsuit seeking to overturn the results in Wisconsin, calling it "extraordinary."

He said: "A sitting President who did not prevail in his bid for reelection has asked for Federal Court help in setting aside the popular vote based on . . . issues he plainly could have raised before the vote occurred."

"This court allowed the plaintiff the chance to make his case, and he has lost on the merits."

Trump has asked for the rule of law to be followed, Judge Ludwig observed, and he said definitively: It has been.

I have been a constitutional law professor for 30 years, and if I were to test my students on these decisions, it would be the easiest test in the world because the plaintiffs have lost nearly every case and every issue in the most sweeping terms. That is all they would have to remember. There is no basis in fact or law to justify the unprecedented relief that is being requested of nullifying these elections.

We are here to count the votes. Let us do our job.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Madam Speaker, to ease everyone's nerve, I want Members to all know that I am not here to challenge anyone to a duel like Alexander Hamilton or Aaron Burr.

Madam Speaker, my primary objection to the counting of the electoral votes of the State of Arizona is based on the Constitution and the direction of State legislatures through State law, as spelled out in the following two clauses of Article II, Section 1, Clause 2: "Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors."

And the election clause of the Constitution provides State legislatures with explicit authority to prescribe "the times, places, and manner of holding elections."

For more than three decades, Arizona law, set by the State legislature, has required that voter registration end no later than 29 days before an election.

This is clear. It is law, unless amended by the State legislature. This is the way it needs to be carried out.

In Arizona, the deadline for voter registration for the 2020 Presidential election was October 5, 2020. Using COVID as a reasoning, Democrats filed a lawsuit to extend this deadline by 18 days. An injunction was made by an Obama-appointed judge preventing the Arizona secretary of state from enforcing the constitutional deadline set by the State legislature.

As a result of this frivolous, partisan lawsuit, 10 extra days were added via



judicial fiat to allow voter registration. These 10 days were added after voting had already begun. This is completely indefensible. You cannot change the rules of an election while it is underway and expect the American people to trust it.

Now, in this 10-day period, at least 30,000 new voters were registered to vote in Arizona. All of these votes are unconstitutional. It does not matter if they voted for President Trump or if they voted for Vice President Biden. They did not register in time for the election. The law states October 5. Either we have laws or we do not.

If we allow State election laws as set forth by the State legislatures to be ignored and manipulated on the whims of partisan lawsuits, unelected bureaucrats, unlawful procedures, and arbitrary rules, then our constitutional Republic will cease to exist.

The oath I took this past Sunday to defend and support the Constitution makes it necessary for me to object to this travesty. Otherwise, the laws passed by the legislative branch merely become suggestions to be accepted, rejected, or manipulated by those who did not pass them.

Madam Speaker, I have constituents outside of this building right now. I promised my voters to be their voice. In this branch of government in which I now serve, it is my separate but equal obligation to weigh in on this election and object.

Are we not a government of, by, and for the people?

They know that this election is not right; and as their Representative, I am sent here to represent them. I will not allow the people to be ignored.

Madam Speaker, it is my duty under the U.S. Constitution to object to the counting of the electoral votes of the State of Arizona. The Members who stand here today and accept the results of this concentrated, coordinated, partisan effort by Democrats, where every fraudulent vote cancels out the vote of an honest America, has sided with extremists on the left.

The United States Congress needs to make an informed decision, and that starts with this objection.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST).

Mr. MAST. Madam Speaker, I rise as well to support the objection, and I rise with the simple question: Can the Chair honestly tell Americans, with a pending Supreme Court case over legal observers not being allowed to observe and inspect signatures, that the laws and the Constitution of that State were not violated to change voting outcomes?

Madam Speaker, I will wait for a response.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST) has 25 seconds remaining.

Mr. MAST. Madam Speaker, I will repeat my question.

Can you honestly tell Americans, with a pending Supreme Court case

over legal observers not being able to observe and inspect signatures, that the laws and Constitution of Arizona were not violated to change voting outcomes?

And I will wait for a response.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

□ 1400

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Speaker, today is an important day. In 1862, during the depths of the Civil War, President Lincoln submitted his annual message to Congress, to this body, and in it, he wrote the following: "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We, of this Congress and this administration, will be remembered in spite of ourselves. . . . The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation. . . . We shall nobly save, or meanly lose, the last best hope of Earth."

Madam Speaker, we gather today to ensure the survival of our grand American experiment, the greatest democracy this world has ever known, and there are millions of people watching today's proceedings. The eyes of the world are on us now, my colleagues, wondering if we will keep the faith, wondering if our constitutional Republic will hold.

Will we adhere to our Constitution, that solemn visionary document that has guided us so well for so long and enabled the peaceful transfer of power for the last 230 years?

Will we continue to be a country premised on the consent of the governed, a Congress that respects the will of the people, and a Republic that will endure?

Madam Speaker, those are the questions before us today. With respect to my new colleague from Colorado, the question is not whether Joe Biden was elected the 46th President of the United States. He clearly was. The people of Arizona, like so much of the country, spoke clearly and resoundingly. They voted in record numbers, and over 81 million Americans selected Joe Biden as the next President.

Now, today, we hear from some in this Chamber—not all, but some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—vague claims of fraud.

No substance.

No evidence.

No facts.

No explanation for why over 88 judges across this land have rejected the very same claims.

Madam Speaker, the bottom line is this. As my colleague, Representative RASKIN, so eloquently put it, the people have spoken, and that is why, on December 14, the electoral college met to certify the election of a duly elected President, just as they have done for centuries during terrible world wars, recessions, depressions, plagues, and pandemics.

They met their duty, and they once again rose to the occasion and certified the election. And the question now is, will we do ours?

Now, I know there are many textualists among us, many of my colleagues who would understand that the Constitution must guide our work today. And the Constitution is crystal clear: Our duty today is a narrow one.

Article II, Section 1, Clause 3 reads: "The President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates, and the votes shall then be counted. The person having the greatest number of votes for President shall be the President."

That is it, period. Our job is not to replace the judgment made by the American people with our own. Yet, that is precisely what so many of my House and Senate Republican colleagues ask this body to do, to substitute their judgment for the expressed will of the American people.

In America, we don't do that. In the United States, we accept the results of free and fair elections.

Madam Speaker, we don't ignore the will of the voters and attempt to install a preferred candidate into power. That doesn't happen here.

Madam Speaker, I will close with this. Our duty, our task, is a very simple one: to honor the voice of the people, to honor our Constitution, to count the votes, to certify this election, and begin to heal this great country of ours.

I pray each of us may find the courage to do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, we have a solemn responsibility today. We must vote to sustain objections to slates of electors submitted by States that we genuinely believe clearly violated the Constitution in the Presidential election of 2020.

This is the threshold legal question before us, and it is an issue before us for the State of Arizona. We have to repeat this for emphasis because a lot of people seem to be confused.

Because judges and not the State legislature changed the rules of the election, Arizona clearly violated the plain language of Article II, Section 1 of the Constitution in its selection of Presidential electors.

The Framers of our Constitution recognized that elections were susceptible to corruption. We all know that. So, how did they fix it? How did they provide for that? They created the electoral college as a safeguard, and they expressly empowered State legislatures to ensure the integrity of our unique election system.

Only the State legislatures, because they are a full body of representatives and not rogue officials, were given the authority to direct the manner of appointing Presidential electors because it was so important.

The Supreme Court has acknowledged this over and over. They previously affirmed in Article II, Section 1, Clause 2: "The appointment of these electors is thus placed absolutely and wholly with the legislatures of the several States." That authority can never be taken away or abdicated.

The Arizona Legislature did enact detailed rules and procedures that the State was supposed to follow to choose its electors. But in the months preceding the 2020 election, as we have heard—and by the way, a thousand pages of evidence have just been submitted on the facts on this—those well-established rules and procedures were deliberately changed.

They weren't changed by the legislature, friends. They were changed by judges. And those actions taken by the judiciary were not limited to mere interpretations of existing law. No, they were substantive, wholesale changes to those statutes.

Madam Speaker, that is a usurpation of the authority that the legislature had. That usurpation was repeated across the country this year. It is the primary reason—it is one of the reasons why the election of 2020 became riddled with an unprecedented number of serious allegations of fraud and irregularities all over the country.

National polls, it has been said, indicate that a huge percentage of Americans now have serious doubts about not just the outcome of this Presidential contest but also the future reliability of our election system itself.

Since we are convinced that the election laws in Arizona and some other key States were changed in this unconstitutional manner, we have a responsibility today. The slates of electors produced under those modified laws are thus unconstitutional. They are not "regularly given" or "lawfully certified," as required by the Electoral Count Act, and they are invalid on their face. That is just the conclusion that you have to reach.

Madam Speaker, given these inescapable facts, we believe we have no choice today but to vote to sustain objections to those slates of electors.

Mr. RASKIN and others today have cited the 12th Amendment, and they cite Article II, Section 1, Clause 3—remember that, Clause 3. And they have asserted that Congress has only one narrow role today; we are just supposed to count the electoral votes that have been submitted. But those advocates have overlooked a critical first principle.

Their assertion is only true so long as Congress first is convinced that the electoral votes were not produced by a process that violated the Constitution is there. We have to get through Clause 2 of Article II, Section 1, before we get to Clause 3 is the point.

Look, in our unique system, Congress is positioned as the last bulwark in a Presidential election to ensure the Constitution has been followed. Indeed, just two decades ago, the Supreme

Court spoke to this. They plainly acknowledged this important deliberative role of Congress. It was the famous *Bush v. Gore* litigation that everybody remembers from 2000.

In a *per curiam* opinion—meaning all nine Justices, that it was unanimous—they noted strict adherence to the provisions of the Electoral Count Act may create "a 'safe harbor' for a State insofar as congressional consideration of its electoral votes is concerned."

However, unanimously, the Court said since title 3, section 5 contains a principle of Federal law that would assure finality of the State's determination if they followed all the proscriptions there, if the will of the legislature is attempted to be changed by a State court, that is a problem. That, they said, Congress might deem to be a change in the law.

That is precisely why we are here right now. Go read *Bush v. Gore*, and you will see this.

Chief Justice William Rehnquist and Justices Scalia and Thomas joined in a concurring opinion 8 days later, and they reiterated this point.

A significant departure from the legislature's scheme for appointing Presidential electors presents a Federal question. It is a big problem for us, and it is one we cannot get around. That is why we are here.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues today to look at the facts, to follow the law, and to follow our congressional oath. We are supposed to support and defend the Constitution. That is what we do here today. I urge everyone to do the right thing.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, this exercise in futility that Congress is undertaking is at the behest of Republican Members of Congress. The effort to overturn the Presidential election and grant Donald Trump 4 more years is the motivation behind it. And to continue a baseless conspiracy-fueled threat to our democracy makes no sense because there is no viable constitutional or legal path to overturn the election that will make Vice President Biden and Senator HARRIS President and Vice President of the United States after January 20.

One certain outcome of this whole process is the weakening of our democracy and the threatening of our democracy. Beginning with Arizona, Congress is being asked to chase down a rabbit hole baseless, discredited, and judicially discarded fringe conspiracy theories.

Madam Speaker, for the record, let's talk a little bit about Arizona. Arizona and State and local officials did an unbelievable job to ensure that the 2020 elections ran smoothly. Mr. Hickman, the Republican chairman of the Maricopa County board, the largest county in the State of Arizona, said: "No matter how you voted, this election was

administered with integrity, transparency, and in accordance with State laws."

Arizonans showed up to the polls in record numbers. More than 3.4 million people voted, with increases in every county, and 65 percent of all eligible voters in Arizona voted in the 2020 election. Arizonans cast their ballots up and down for Republicans and Democrats, and 11 electoral votes were granted to Joe Biden and KAMALA HARRIS based on their victory in Arizona. That is the story.

Arizonans voted in hundreds of races this year. In addition to the Presidency, these races include nine members of the State's congressional delegation that are with you—four of them, my Republican colleagues. These Members have already been seated in the 117th Congress. They do not question the accuracy of Arizona's 2020 elections to select the congressional delegation, yet my four Republican colleagues question the Presidential election.

Our colleagues may say they are only asking questions and seeking to reassure voters, but let us be clear: These questions have been answered by the voters and by the courts. Rather than accepting the answers and the results of the election, they are fanning the flames of unfounded suspicion and once again creating a threat, a very real and dangerous threat to our democracy.

Again, our friends do not question the outcomes of their own elections. That is because they have no reason to, just as they have no legitimate reason to question the results of the Presidential election in Arizona.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to reject this objection, to respect the will of the voters in the State of Arizona and throughout this country, and to fundamentally add some preservation to our democracy from any future damage, that this effort that we are undertaking in this House and in the Senate today does not further damage our democracy.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of my objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, I filed my challenge on the slate of electors from the State of Arizona that was actually put forward by Governor Ducey of Arizona.

My ask to you, the Speaker, through the Vice President, is simple. Do not count these electors until and unless the secretary of state allows a forensic audit of the election, a request she has denied repeatedly.

We have been told over and over that even though this was a public election using public money and public machines utilizing public employees, the public today has no ability to simply double-check the veracity of these results.

□ 1415

If the Presidential election was a football game, we would get a slow-motion review from multiple angles and a



correction of a controversial decision. But not so, we are told by our secretary of state, for the Presidential election, no review for you.

No access to the Dominion voting machines with a documented history of enabling fraud through its now discredited adjudication system, a system that literally allows one person to change tens of thousands of votes in mere minutes.

In the only audit done in Arizona, a court found 3 percent error rate against President Trump. Vice President Biden's margin of error was one-tenth of that, at 0.03 percent. By the way, a 3 percent error rate at minimum is 90,000 ballots. After finding the 3 percent error rate, the court stopped the audit and refused to go further.

In Arizona, as my attachments make clear, mail-in ballots were altered on the first day of counting as shown in data graphs we have provided, as concluded by data analysts. Over 400,000 mail-in ballots were altered, switched from President Trump to Vice President Biden, or completely erased from President Trump's totals.

The proof is in the counting curves, the curves that cannot occur except with odds so rare and unlikely that winning the Mega Millions lottery is more probable.

Mr. Speaker, can I have order in the Chamber?

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCGOVERN). Pursuant to clause 12(b) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1426

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCGOVERN) at 2 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) has 2¾ minutes remaining.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, the probability of these ectopic curves, you have a better likelihood of winning the Mega Millions lottery than you do having statistical issues here.

Over 30,000 illegal aliens voted in Arizona using the Federal ballot, yet our secretary of state refused the public access to review the ballots.

Over a thousand residences were visited for proof of residency and address; 456 failed that test. They were vacant lots. Even the Recorder's office was used as an address.

What are they hiding? If the process was fair, these would be improbable. These would be once-in-a-lifetime-type applications.

So let's look at the ballots, the signatures, and the adjudicated records. Until this is done, Mr. Speaker, we should not count this slate.

You have a letter from the Arizona Legislature stating its intent to review

the issue on January 11. Our Governor has refused to allow the State to properly convene to do its proper oversight.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you one question today: Are you a ceremonial figurehead in your current role, or did the drafters of the 12th Amendment and Congress, in the Electoral Count Act of 1887, envision a role where you made discretionary decisions about ballot fraud and fair elections?

If you are merely ceremonial, then let's be done with this. Let's eat our tea and crumpets and witness our national decline.

But if you are not merely ceremonial but vested with discernment, rationality, and legal authority to not just count from 1 to 270, then do not accept Arizona's electors as certified. Remand the slate back to the secretary of state, back to the Governor, with the following instructions: Until a full, complete electoral forensic audit is allowed by the secretary of state, the electors currently certified will not be counted.

It will then fall on the State of Arizona to decide are its electors in the game or not. Anything less is an abdication of our constitutional Republic and our ethos: one man, one vote.

We ask: Why? What is there to hide? Shouldn't the lawful victor of an election be proud, open, and transparent about an election audit? I would. Instead, we are met with denials, cover-ups, and contempt of subpoenas.

There is too much evidence of fraud, demonstrated by statistical anomalies that experts have determined cannot happen in the absence of fraud, to accept such a slate. I am not asking these electors never be counted; it is just that they need to be certified the proper way.

Our beloved Constitution is but a mere piece of paper if we do not follow the law, upholding the law. But now, alas, we find ourselves lawless, destroying the very thread that binds us together. But we need to get back to the rule of law. That is what has been violated, truly, by the actions in these States.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(b) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2102

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 9 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will address the Chamber.

Today, a shameful assault was made on our democracy. It cannot, however, deter us from our responsibility to validate the election of Joe Biden and KAMALA HARRIS. For that reason, Congress has returned to the Capitol.

We always knew that this responsibility would take us into the night, and

we will stay as long as it takes. Our purpose will be accomplished. We must, and we will, show to the country, and indeed to the world, that we will not be diverted from our duty, that we will respect our responsibility to the Constitution and to the American people.

On Sunday, it was my great honor to be sworn in as Speaker and to preside over a sacred ritual of renewal as we gathered under the stone of the temple of democracy to open the 117th Congress. I said, as we were sworn in then, we accept a responsibility as daunting and demanding as any previous generation of leadership has ever faced.

We know that we are in difficult times, but little could we have imagined the assault that was made on our democracy today.

To those who stoked deterrence from our responsibility, you have failed. To those who engaged in the gleeful desecration of this, our temple of democracy, American democracy, justice will be done.

Today, January 6, is the Feast of the Epiphany. On this day of revelation, let us pray that this instigation to violence will provide an epiphany for our country to heal.

In that spirit of healing, I invoke the song of Saint Francis. I usually do. Saint Francis is the patron saint of my city of San Francisco, and the "Song of Saint Francis" is our anthem.

Lord, make me a channel of thy peace.

Where there is darkness, may I bring light.

Where there is hatred, let us bring love.

Where there is despair, let us bring hope.

We know that we would be part of history in a positive way today, every 4 years when we demonstrate again the peaceful transfer of power from one President to the next, and despite the shameful actions of today, we still will do so. We will be part of a history that shows the world what America is made of, that this assault, this assault is just that. It shows the weakness of those who have had to show through violence what their message was.

My colleagues, it is time to move on. I wear this pin quite frequently. Actually, I gave it to our beloved JOHN LEWIS just the weekend or so before he left us. It is the flag of our country, a flag of the United States of America. On it, it says, "One country, one destiny."

"One country, one destiny" is written on the flag. That was also what was embroidered in Abraham Lincoln's coat that he had on that fateful night—Lincoln's party, Lincoln's message: One country, one destiny.

So on this holy day of Epiphany, let us pray. I am a big believer in prayer. Let us pray that there will be peace on Earth and that it will begin with us. Let us pray that God will continue to bless America.

With that, let us proceed with our responsibilities to the Constitution to which we have just, within 72 hours, taken the oath to uphold.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, it is a sad day in America. It is a wrenching day in America. It is a day in which our words and our actions have had consequences of a very, very negative nature. We ought to watch our words and think what it may mean to some.

My remarks were written before the tragic, dangerous, and unacceptable actions—and “unacceptable” is such a tame word. My remarks started with, “Madam Speaker, the American people today are witnessing one of the greatest challenges to our democracy in its 244-year history.”

Little did I know that this Capitol would be attacked by the enemy within. I was here on 9/11 when we were attacked by the enemy without.

We need to all work together to tame and reduce the anger and, yes, the hate that some stoke. What some—not all, Madam Speaker, but some—in this House and this Senate are doing today will not change the outcome of the election, which is the clear and insurmountable victory of President-elect Biden and Vice-President-elect Harris. Instead, all they will accomplish is to further the dangerous divisions.

This was written before this Capitol was assaulted, before this democracy was put aside by thousands, encouraged by the Commander in Chief.

Instead, all they will accomplish is to further the dangerous divisions, as I said, among our people and energize conspiracy theories stoked by our foreign adversaries, which seek to erode America’s confidence in our democracy and our system of free and fair elections.

I was here in 2000. I was strongly in favor of Al Gore for President, and my candidate got more votes than the other candidate. His name was George Bush, of course. And one of the saddest days was January 20th of 2001 when our candidate, who won the election, in my view, was not elected. But it was also one of the proudest moments of my career because the greatest power on Earth passed peacefully from Bill Clinton to George W. Bush.

Not a shot was fired. Nobody assaulted this Caucus or this Congress or this Chamber. Because we were not disappointed? No. Because we were not angry? No. Because we believe in democracy. We believe in “We the people.”

One of the speakers, I think it was the Senator from Texas, expressed: We are here for the people.

If those were the people, we are in a lot of trouble.

Our electoral system, our democratic system, however, did not break under the strains of the misinformation, the claims of fraud, which court after court

after court have dismissed out of hand, not because there was a little evidence, but because there was no evidence.

That is why we are the longest-lasting constitutional democracy in the world. I hope all of us in this body are proud of that and understand why that is the case. Because, as Dick Gephardt said on this floor many years ago, democracy is a substitute for war to resolve differences. It proved once more the ever-beating strong heart that gives life to our Republic and our freedoms.

That strength, Madam Speaker, is derived in part from our institution and our laws, but most importantly, it is powered by citizens’ and leaders’ commitment to our Constitution. Not just us. We swear an oath. But it is all of America.

Barack Obama spoke from that Chamber, and he said: I am going to be taking another title next year—citizen.

And he was proud to take that. And every citizen needs to protect, preserve, and uplift our democracy.

Some today did not do that, many today.

Sixty-eight years ago in Springfield, Illinois, Governor Adlai Stevenson gracefully conceded his loss to General Dwight Eisenhower. He said this: “It is traditionally American,” he told his deeply disappointed supporters, “to fight hard before an election.”

□ 2115

But then he added, it is equally traditional to close ranks as soon as the people have spoken—not the Congress, not the electors, the people have spoken.

That which unites us as American citizens is far greater than that which divides us as political parties.

It was another man from Springfield, fourscore and 8 years earlier, who won reelection to the Presidency in the national crisis that tested our country and its democratic institutions, who pleaded even in his hour of victory for the same spirit of reconciliation. That was the party of Lincoln. That hasn’t happened to this hour.

Lincoln said: “. . . now that the election is over,” he asked, “may not all, having a common interest, reunite in a common effort to save our common country?”

Such is the duty of an American who stands for elections, or participates in our politics, to be either humble in triumph or gracious in defeat.

I have lost some elections—not too many—and I have won a lot of elections. I hope that I have been gracious in defeat and humble in victory. I hope that I put my State and my country first, not myself.

It is clear to all that the outgoing President has not followed the path that Stevenson and Lincoln urged. So, we, the people—each one of us represents about 750,000 to 800,000 people, some a few less. The people, they have spoken in the way that our Constitution set for them to be heard by us and

by the country—they voted, and they voted pretty decisively.

We, the people, together, must turn away from division and its dangers.

The senior Member of our body, DON YOUNG from Alaska, spoke the other day when we were sworn in and said: Ladies and gentlemen of this House, we are so divisive that it is going to destroy our country. We need to reach out and hold one another’s hands.

We all have a title that we honor more than any other—perhaps parent, perhaps husband. But we are all Americans. Not Americans-R; not Americans-D. We are Americans.

Let us hope tonight that we act like Americans. Not as Ds and Rs, but as Americans, just as Al Gore, just as Hillary Clinton, just as Adlai Stevenson, just as Abraham Lincoln, who had won that election, of course. But he had defeated people, and he said that is not the issue; the issue is to reunite.

We, the people, must again be the strong heart of our American democracy.

We, the people, on this day in Congress, must be agents of unity and constructive action to face the grave threats that confront us and tell those who would assault our Capitol: That is not the American way.

We, the Members of Congress, who swore an oath before God to preserve and protect the Constitution of the United States and our democracy, must do so now.

I don’t usually read Senator MCCONNELL’s speeches, but I am not speaking as a Democrat, nor was he speaking as a Republican just a few hours ago.

“We’re debating a step that has never been taken in American history, whether Congress should overrule the voters and overturn a Presidential election.”

He went on to say that he supports a strong State-led voting reform.

“The Constitution,” he said, “gives us here in Congress a limited role. We cannot simply declare ourselves a national board of elections on steroids. The voters, the courts, and the States have all spoken.”

Five people said the election of 2000 was over. We didn’t agree with them. But Al Gore said: We are a nation of laws. Five people—yes, they were members of the Supreme Court, but they were five people—said the election is over. I sat on that podium and saw that power transfer to George W. Bush.

MCCONNELL went on to say: “If we overrule them, it would damage our Republic forever.”

He said that, MCCONNELL, the Republican leader of the Senate, about 2 hours ago, 3 hours ago, now 4 hours.

He went on to say: “If this election were overturned by mere allegations from the losing side, our democracy would enter a death spiral.”

He concluded: “It would be unfair and wrong to disenfranchise American voters and overrule the courts and the States on this extraordinarily thin basis. And I will not pretend such a



vote would be a harmless protest gesture . . ."

How presciently he spoke. People who think that the election has been stolen with some fraud, why do they think it? Because the Commander in Chief said so, and they respect him and they follow him. And words matter.

"Pete," as he ended, "I will not pretend such a vote would be a harmless protest gesture while relying on others to do the right thing. I will vote to respect the people's decision and defend our system of government as we know it."

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this objection, as MCCONNELL said, a danger to our democracy.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I rise for a point of personal privilege to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I rise to address what happened in this Chamber today and where do we go from here.

The violence, destruction, and chaos we saw earlier was unacceptable, undemocratic, and un-American. It was the saddest day I have ever had serving as a Member of this institution.

The Capitol was in chaos. Police officers were attacked. Guns were drawn on this very floor. A woman tragically lost her life.

No one wins when this building and what it stands for are destroyed. America, and this institution, is better than that.

We saw the worst of America this afternoon. Yet, in the midst of violence and fear, we also saw the best of America.

It starts with our law enforcement—the Capitol Police, the National Guard, the FBI, and the Secret Service—who faced the most difficult challenges but did their duty with confidence and strength. Many of them are injured right now.

It also extends to this Chamber, where both Democrats and Republicans showed courage, calm, and resolve.

I would like to recognize the Members now who helped to hold the line: MARKWAYNE MULLIN, TONY GONZALES, JASON CROW, PAT FALLON, and TROY NEHLS. Working with the Capitol Police, they ensured the floor of this Chamber was never breached. These are the heroes among us. Thank you for the show of courage.

Looking back on the past few hours, it is clear this Congress will not be the same after today, and I hope it will be the better. I hope not just this institution, but I hope every American pauses for that moment and thinks among themselves that we can disagree with one another but not dislike each other; we can respect the voices of others.

There are many times we debate in this body, and we should. There are many times we can get heated. I still consider STENY HOYER a very good friend. There are times I get upset, and I will call him at home to express the

things I may not see fair or just, but that is the way we should handle things.

The majority leader is right: We are all Americans first.

But we should also think for a moment: What do we put on social media? What do we convey to one another? Just because you have a personal opinion different than mine, you have a right to say it, but nobody has a right to become a mob. And we all should stand united in condemning the mob together.

We solve problems before our Nation, not through destruction, but through debate. That is the heart of this democracy. I know what we debate today is tough, but it is just; it is right.

This isn't the first side of the aisle that has ever debated this issue. I thought of what Madam Speaker said back in 2005, "this is democracy at its best," when they talked about a Presidential election in Ohio.

These are the moments that we should raise the issue about integrity and accountability and accuracy in our elections. But you know what we should do, the next difference? Not just raise the issue, but work together to solve the problems.

Now is the moment to show America we can work best together. I will tell you, the size of the majority is slim, so it gives us the opportunity to make that happen. The only thing that can hold us back is the will of one another to do it.

This side of the aisle always believes in working with anybody who wants to move it forward. That does not mean that we are going to agree 100 percent of the time. That does not mean our voice cannot be heard. That does not mean we cannot be treated fairly; we should be. That may mean on the size of committees, that means on our ability to offer an amendment, that means on our ability to have our voice. But at the end of the day, it helps us come to a better conclusion.

By returning here to complete the work we were sent to do, we are proving that our democracy cannot be disrupted by criminal behavior. We will not falter; we will not bend; and we will not shrink from our duty.

Let me be very clear: Mobs don't rule America. Laws rule America. It was true when our cities were burning this summer, and it is true now.

When Americans go to bed tonight, their lasting memory should not be a Congress overrun by rioters. It must be a resolute Congress conducting healthy debate.

We may disagree on a lot in America, but tonight we should show the world that we will respectfully, but thoroughly, carry out the most basic duties of democracy.

We will continue with the task that we have been sent here to do. We will follow the Constitution and the law and the process for hearing valid concerns about election integrity. We will do it with respect.

□ 2130

We will respect your opinion, we will respect what you say, and we are willing to listen to it. I think the Nation will be better for it on both sides of the aisle. Let's show the country the mob did not win. We have a job to do. Let's do it with pride and let's be better when the sun rises tomorrow.

Mr. STANTON. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STANTON. Madam Speaker, over the last few hours, we have seen the consequences of dangerous un-American rhetoric; an armed insurrection against the seat of government of the most powerful country on Earth; a breach of this Capitol building to attack Congress, something that has not taken place since the British occupied this building during the War of 1812; an attempted coup spurred by rhetoric coming from those who are looking out for themselves, not country.

It is stunning, Madam Speaker, that there are some in this House who have voiced support for what happened. It was not a protest. It was treason. It was sedition. And it should be prosecuted as such.

At its root is a disease that has infected our politics, one that will make some political leaders do anything, including lie and incite violence to hold on to power. That is what we are seeing before our very eyes.

In contesting the outcome of this election, my Republican colleagues make a contradictory argument that puts party and power before country. They argue the election results were valid when it showed they won their races, but the same ballots were somehow fraudulent when it produced a result President Trump did not like.

Keep the results we like, they demand, cancel the one we don't.

That is not how democracy works, and neither is armed insurrection.

Here is the truth: Arizona has a long bipartisan record of conducting safe, secure, and fair elections. And I say that as someone whose party has more often than not been on the losing end of those elections. This last election was, once again, safe and secure. And I commend our State and county election officials, public servants on both sides of the aisle, for making Arizona proud once again.

We are here because the case that Republicans have brought before us has failed in court over and over and over again.

My colleagues say: Let's go back to the State, let them decide.

My friends, Arizona has spoken. They have sent the correct electors.

Arizona's Republican attorney general, one of the most partisan in the country, said: "There is no evidence, there are no facts that would lead anyone to believe the election results will change."

The Republican speaker of our State house has told us he doesn't like the

results of the election, but they are the right results. Joe Biden has won Arizona.

The State supreme court, made up entirely of justices appointed by Republican Governors, has spoken, too. The court said the President's challenge "fails to present any evidence of misconduct, illegal votes, or that the Biden electors did not in fact receive the highest numbers of votes for office."

Look to the words of one of the President's own campaign chairs in my State, our Governor, Doug Ducey. Our Governor loves the President. He has been so loyal. He made sure the President could hold large rallies in our State in the middle of a pandemic. The Governor personally attended them. They spoke so often that the Governor gave the President a special "Hail to the Chief" ring tone on his phone.

After election day, as the legal challenges played out, the Governor kept quiet; but when the truth became clear, even he acknowledged "Joe Biden did win Arizona."

I am grateful that, in this instance, the Governor put law, not partisan politics, first. And I urge my colleagues in the House to follow his lead.

Each and every one of us in this House, the people's House, swore an oath to preserve, protect, and defend our Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. Over the last few hours, we have gained a better understanding of what that means.

The future of the Constitution, the most precious of the founding documents of the greatest democracy human kind has ever known, is in our hands. Defending democracy is not, and should not be, a partisan task. It is a sacred one. Right here, right now, we must recognize that fidelity to the founding principles of our Nation are not about loyalty to one man, but rather to ensure that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the Earth.

The world is watching us all right now. We must get it right. Reject this ill-conceived attack on our democracy.

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I rise with a heavy heart. This has been a truly tragic day for America. We all join together in fully condemning the dangerous violence and destruction that occurred today in our Nation's Capitol.

Americans will always have their freedom of speech and the constitutional right to protest, but violence in any form is absolutely unacceptable. It is anti-America, and must be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

Thank you to the heroic United States Capitol Police. And thank you to the bipartisan professional staff of the United States Capitol for protecting the people's House and the American people.

This hallowed temple of democracy is where generations of Americans have peacefully come together to face our Nation's greatest challenges, bridge our deepest fissures, and create a more perfect system of government. This is the appropriate place we stand to respectfully and peacefully give voice to the people we represent across our diverse country.

The Representatives of the American people in this House are standing up for three fundamental American beliefs: The right to vote is sacred, that a Representative has a duty to represent his or her constituents, and that the rule of law is a hallmark of our Nation.

And in the spirit of healing—those are not my words—those are the words of you, Madam Speaker, from this very Chamber, when some of my colleagues and friends across the aisle objected to the 2005 electoral college certification.

In fact, there were objections on this floor to the certification of nearly every Republican President in my lifetime: In 1989, in 2001, in 2005, and in 2017.

So history is our guide that the people's sacred House is the appropriate venue for a peaceful debate. And this peaceful debate serves as a powerful condemnation to the violence that perpetrated our Capitol grounds today. The violence that was truly un-American.

Today's discussion is about the Constitution and it is about the American people, but it must also be about clearly and resolutely condemning the violence that occurred today.

I am honored each and every day to represent New York's 21st Congressional District, and I believe it is my solemn and sacred duty to serve as their voice and their vote in the people's House.

Tens of millions of Americans are concerned that the 2020 election featured unconstitutional overreach by unelected State officials and judges ignoring State election laws. We can and we should peacefully and respectfully discuss these concerns.

In Pennsylvania, the State supreme court and secretary of state unilaterally and unconstitutionally rewrote election law eliminating signature matching requirements.

In Georgia, there was constitutional overreach when the secretary of state unilaterally and unconstitutionally gutted signature matching for absentee ballots and, in essence, eliminated voter verification required by State election law.

In Wisconsin, officials issued illegal rules to circumvent a State law, passed by the legislature as the Constitution requires, but required absentee voters to provide further identification before obtaining a ballot.

In Michigan, signed affidavits document numerous unconstitutional irregularities: Officials physically blocking the legal right of poll watchers to observe vote counts, the illegal counting

of late ballots, and hand-stamping ballots with the previous day's date.

My North Country constituents and the American people cherish the Constitution. They know, according to the Constitution, elected officials closest to the people in State legislatures have the power of the pen to write election law, not unelected bureaucrats, judges, Governors, or secretaries of state.

To the tens of thousands of constituents who have reached out to me, thank you. Please know that I am listening and I hear you, both those who agree and those who disagree. Our Constitutional Republic will endure this tragic day because the Founding Fathers understood Congress and the American people would face unprecedented and historic challenges by debating them on this very floor.

I believe that the most precious foundation and the covenant of our Republic is the right to vote, and the faith in the sanctity of our Nation's free and fair elections. We must work together in this House to rebuild that faith so that all our elections are free, fair, secure, safe and, most importantly, that they are according to the United States Constitution.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, today, the people's House was attacked, which is an attack on the Republic itself. There is no excuse for it. A woman died. And people need to go to jail. And the President should never have spun up certain Americans to believe something that simply cannot be.

I applaud House leadership of both parties for bringing us back to do our job, which is to count the electors and no more.

The problem we face, though, is even bigger. We are deeply divided. We are divided about even life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The words which used to bind us together now, at times, tear us apart because we disagree about what they even mean.

My constituents at home in Texas are genuinely upset. I say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, we have a constant barrage of those who wish to remake America into a socialist welfare State, efforts to attack our institutions, tear down statues, erase our history, defund our police. We have seen the debasing of our language. We teach our children that America is evil. We destroy our sovereignty, empower cartels. We attack our Second Amendment. We destroy small businesses through lockdowns. We divide ourselves by race. We can't even agree that there is man and woman. We extinguish the unborn before they even have a chance to see daylight.

But at the heart of our path forward lies the essence of our Republic, its cornerstone. That we are a union of States bound together for common defense and economic strength, and more



so bound together through federalism in which we may live together peacefully as citizens in this vast land agreeing to disagree, free to live according to our own beliefs and according to the dictates of our conscience.

Now, many of my colleagues were poised this afternoon to vote to insert Congress into the constitutionally prescribed decisionmaking of the States by rejecting the sole official electors sent to us by each of the States of the Union. I hope they will reconsider.

I can tell you that I was not going to, and I will not be voting to reject the electors. And that vote may well sign my political death warrant, but so be it. I swore an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States, and I will not bend its words into contortions for personal political expediency.

Number one, rejecting the electors certified to Congress by sovereign States violates the 12th Amendment and the entirety of the Constitution it amends, notwithstanding claims that you must read certain sections first. It is clear, it is black and white, we count. It is ministerial. And our only job is to count the electors before us. We have only one slate of electors per State sent to us under color of law, and no more.

Number two, to the extent you believe we do have constitutional authority to reject, we are arguing using incomplete and often misleading data points to prove it. I am not afforded time to go point by point, but there are more misleading claims than legitimate ones.

□ 2145

Three, rejecting the electors ignores the Founder's specific admonition that Congress not choose the President, as articulated in Federalist No. 68.

Four, indeed, the Founders drafted the inclusion of a phrase specifically putting Congress into the manner of the election process then specifically rejected it.

Five, if more than a trivial bloc of this body votes to reject a sovereign State's electors, it will irrevocably empower Congress to take over the selection of Presidential electors, and doing so will almost certainly guarantee future Houses will vote to reject the electors of Texas or any of our States for whatever reason.

Six, voting to reject the electors is not remotely consistent with our vote on Sunday, a vote I forced to highlight the very hypocrisy: to accept the outcome of the election of ourselves through elections conducted under the same rules, by procedures put in place by the same executive branch officials, impacted by rulings from the same judges, State and Federal. To do so is entirely inexplicable on its face.

Seven, the argument for rejection most given by my colleagues is based on the allegations of systemic election abuse by executive or judicial branch officials interfering with the "legislatures thereof" in Article II.

Many States made poor policy decisions. Whether these poor policy decisions violate State laws is a contested matter and a matter for the States to resolve for themselves.

More, five of the six legislatures are controlled by Republicans. Not one body has sent separate electors. Not one body has sent us even a letter by a majority of its whole body. The only body, the Pennsylvania Senate, who managed to come up with a majority of Republicans to complain only did so yesterday in an eleventh-hour face-saving political statement. Not one GOP statewide official has formally called on us to change. Not one law enforcement organization, State or Federal, has presented a case of malfeasance.

History will judge this moment.

Let us not turn the last firewall for liberty we have remaining on its head in a fit of populist rage for political expediency when there is plenty of looking into the mirror for Republicans to do for destroying our election systems with expansion of mail-in ballots.

I may well get attacked for this, but I will not abandon my oath to the Constitution. And I will make clear that I am standing up in defense of that Constitution to protect our federalist order and the electoral college, which empowers the very States we represent to stand athwart the long arm of this Federal Government by its very design.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, for years, Democrats and their media allies deceived America about Trump-Russian collusion and the extent of foreign interference in the 2016 elections. Yet, in 2020, Democrats promoted massive foreign interference in American elections by helping illegal aliens and other noncitizens vote in American elections, thereby canceling the votes of and stealing elections from American citizens.

Want evidence? Exhibit A. In 1993, Democrats rammed through Congress the National Voter Registration Act, making it illegal—illegal—to require proof of citizenship that prevents illegal aliens and noncitizens from registering to vote.

Why did Democrats do that? Simple. To steal elections, of course.

Exhibit B. How bad is the noncitizen voting problem? In 2005, Democrat President Jimmy Carter's Commission on Federal Election Reform warned that "noncitizens have registered to vote in several recent elections" and recommended that "all States should use their best efforts to obtain proof of citizenship before registering voters."

Exhibit C. A June 2005 General Accountability Office report discovered that up to 3 percent of people on voter registration lists are not U.S. citizens.

Exhibit D. In 2008, Electoral Studies surveyed 339 noncitizens. Eight percent admitted voting in American elections.

As an aside, I have seen higher percentages in other studies.

Exhibit E. The 2010 Census counted 11 million illegal aliens in America.

Exhibit F. A 2018 Yale study estimated as many as 22 million illegal aliens in America.

Exhibit G. The math means between 880,000 and 1.72 million illegal aliens illegally voted in the 2020 elections.

Exhibit H. In 2014, Old Dominion University and George Mason University professors surveyed noncitizens and illegal aliens and found they vote Democrat roughly 80 percent of the time.

Exhibit I. The math is again straightforward. The 60 percent Biden advantage times the illegal alien voting number means Joe Biden gained roughly 1,032,000 votes from illegal alien voting. That is the high number.

Exhibit J. While no one knows for sure how massive the illegal alien voting bloc is, we do know Joe Biden and his campaign believed it large enough and critical enough to winning the Presidential race that, at the October 22 Presidential debate, Joe Biden publicly solicited the illegal alien bloc vote by promising: "Within 100 days, I am going to send to the United States Congress a pathway to citizenship for over 11 million undocumented people."

Ladies and gentlemen, Madam Speaker, that is the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow for illegal aliens. Joe Biden knew exactly what he was doing by seeking the illegal alien bloc vote. After all, on May 11, 1993, then-Senator Joe Biden voted for the National Voter Registration Act, which makes it illegal to require proof of citizenship from illegal aliens and other noncitizens when they seek to register to vote.

Madam Speaker, the evidence is compelling and irrefutable. Noncitizens overwhelmingly voted for Joe Biden in exchange for the promised amnesty and citizenship and in so doing helped steal the election from Donald Trump, Republican candidates, and American citizens across America.

Madam Speaker, in my judgment, if only lawful votes cast by eligible American citizens are counted, Joe Biden lost and President Trump won the electoral college.

As such, it is my constitutional duty to promote honest and accurate elections by rejecting electoral college vote submissions from States whose electoral systems are so badly flawed as to render their vote submissions unreliable, untrustworthy, and unworthy of acceptance.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, as a proud Republican, I rise in opposition to the objection to the electorate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I come to this side of the aisle as a proud Republican but, most importantly, as a proud American.

Today, we saw an assault on our democracy. I love this institution. I love the United States Congress, and I love

the United States of America. And what I saw today was mob rule that spat upon the blood of my father that is in the soil of Europe and in the soil of Korea, and who gave us through that blood this sacred Constitution and the sacred ability to lead this world as a power that says we settle our differences not with mob rule; we settle our difference through elections. And when those elections are over, we have a peaceful transition of power.

Now, make no mistake to my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle, I will be passionate in my disagreement with you. I will be passionate in my ideas for the future of this country, and I will fight for my Republican ideas that I hold near and dear. But I will stand with you tonight and send a message to the Nation and all Americans that what we saw today was not American, and what we see tonight in this body shall be what we do in America, and that is to transfer power in a peaceful way.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding and for standing with me and with all of us.

TOM REED is my co-chair of the Problem Solvers Caucus. He is a Republican, and I am a Democrat. When it comes to policy views, we often disagree. But at the end of the day, we are united as Americans. My good friend, like me, always puts country first.

Today, a group of lawless thugs sought to upend the Constitution and the peaceful transition of power because they didn't like the outcome of the Presidential election. So, they tried to nullify it using improvised explosives, shattering windows, breaking down doors, injuring law enforcement, and even tearing down the American flag that rises above this beacon of democracy.

But their attempt to obstruct democracy failed. Their insurrection was foiled. The American people and the greatest democracy the world has ever known won.

Abraham Lincoln, who served in this very body, famously said: "A house divided against itself cannot stand." That is why, for the sake of this country, we must stand together, united, and celebrate a peaceful transition of power.

In 14 days, President-elect Biden will be sworn in. And despite all of our differences, I have faith that, for the American people, we will come together, Democrats and Republicans, committed to unity, civility, and truth. We will recognize our higher purpose to help America through these dark days.

That is the only way we will beat COVID, rebuild our economy, and stand up to threats at home and abroad.

Working together as Democrats and Republicans, I know our best days will always be ahead of us.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to always search their conscience and their souls. I respect my Republican colleagues and my Democratic colleagues, but today, let us pause and remember what happened here today. Let us pause that our tenure in this Congress will far surpass the time that we stay here. And let us pause and cast our votes today recognizing that what we do here today will set the course of this institution for years to come.

This institution, Madam Speaker, shall not fail because the United States of America shall forever be the beacon of hope, the inspiration to all.

May God bless our great country.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, my constitutional oath is sacred, and I have a duty to speak out about confirmed evidence-filled issues with the administration of the 2020 Presidential election in certain battleground States.

Signature verification, ballot observation, voter roll integrity, voter ID requirements, and ballot collection protections were weakened on top of the millions of mailboxes that were flooded with unrequested mail-in ballots.

Many of my constituents have been outraged and demanding that I voice their objections here today.

This debate is necessary because rogue election officials, secretaries of state, and courts circumvented State election laws. They made massive changes to how their State's election would be run. These acts, among other issues, were unlawful and unconstitutional.

Congress has the duty to defend the Constitution and any powers of State legislatures that were usurped.

Some claim today's objections set new precedent by challenging State electors. That claim, of course, ignores that Democrats have objected every time a Republican Presidential candidate has won an election over the past generation. If you don't have any observations today, that is your call, but don't lecture about precedent.

Over the past 4 years, Democrats boycotted President Trump's inauguration and State of the Union Addresses, pushed the Trump-Russia collusion conspiracies and investigations and knowingly lied about it, voted to impeach the President before even knowing what to impeach him for, and then actually passed Articles of Impeachment before Senate Democrats voted to remove him from office.

Today's debate is necessary, especially because of the insistence that everything President Trump and his supporters say about the 2020 election is evidence-free. That is simply not true.

No one can honestly claim it is evidence-free. When I say that, in Arizona,

courts unilaterally extended the legislatively set deadline to register to vote.

□ 2200

The Arizona State Senate issued subpoenas post-election to get information from the Maricopa County board on various election matters, but the board and the courts refused to help at all to let the State senate complete its constitutional duties.

In Pennsylvania, where State legislators wrote us about their powers being usurped, the Democrat majority on the State supreme court changed signature, signature matching and postal marking requirements. The date to submit mail-in ballots was extended contradictory to the date set by State law.

The State legislature expanded no-excuse mail-in balloting without a constitutional amendment. Constitutions apply to the acts of all branches of government.

The issue was magnified by the voter rolls being so inaccurate that more voters submitted ballots than there were registered voters. Signature authentication rules for absentee and mail-in ballots were weakened by the Democrat secretary of the Commonwealth without authorization. Ballot defects were allowed to be cured in some counties but not others. There were poll watchers denied the ability to closely observe ballot counting operations.

In Georgia, the secretary of state unilaterally entered into a settlement agreement with the Democratic Party, changing statutory requirements for confirming voter identity. Challenging defective signatures was made far more difficult, and the settlement even required election officials to consider issuing training materials drafted by an expert retained by the Democratic Party.

In Wisconsin, election officials assisted voters on how to circumvent the State's voter ID laws and signature verification laws, while also placing unmanned drop boxes in locations picked to boost Democrat turnout. The Democracy in the Park event in Wisconsin had over 17,000 ballots transferred that shouldn't have been.

These are all facts and certainly not "evidence free."

Americans deserve nothing less than full faith and confidence in their elections and a guarantee that their vote—their voice—counts and that their concerns are being heard. That is why we need to have this debate today, whether you like it or not.

This isn't about us. This is about our Constitution, our elections. This is about our people and our Republic.

Mr. GALLEGOS. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GALLEGOS. Madam Speaker, I am the proud son of immigrants. Growing up, I heard stories about parties,



politicians, and Presidents invalidating elections when the people took power for themselves. That is why, when I joined the Marine Corps, the most sacred part of my oath was to protect the Constitution of the United States.

I never thought I would have to do that on the floor of Congress, but here we are. The people have spoken, and the power of the people, the Constitution, will be preserved.

Madam Speaker, I left my youth, I left my sanity, I left it all in Iraq for this country because there is this one precious idea that we all had, that we all believed: that this country was going to protect everyone's individual rights, that you were going to be able to vote, that you were going to be able to preserve democracy and pass it on as a legacy, as an inheritance to every American.

But today—today—there was treason in this House. Today, there were traitors in this House.

So I am not asking my Republican colleagues to help me and stop this objection to Arizona; I am asking you to get off all these objections. It is time for you to save your soul. It is time for you to save your country.

That man at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue will forget you. He will use you and he will dump you to the side, but what will be left will be the stain—the stain—on democracy that you are engaging in right now.

Listen to yourselves. I consider most of you very smart, believe it or not, but the idea that we would rig an election for the President but not preserve the congressional seats for all of our friends that we just lost in the last election is absurd.

The idea that we would help Vice President Biden win but wouldn't make sure that we got enough Senators in the Senate for us to pass a full agenda is absurd.

The idea that there was somehow nefarious border registration in Arizona that tipped the scale when, during that same time of border registration, there were more registered voters that were Republicans than Democrats is absurd.

You are better than this. Many of you did serve, many of you have never served, but there is an opportunity and a time for courage. I hope you never have to face fire or bullets or bombs for your country, but right now—right now—this country is asking you to be better. Right now, this country is asking you to show courage.

That man will leave. Your soul will stay with you for the rest of your life.

You owe it to democracy. You owe it to the hundreds and thousands of men and women that have sacrificed their life.

You know better. You are better. Be the good American. Be the American you want. Preserve this democracy; reject this movement; and stop this terrorism that is happening from the White House.

The SPEAKER. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, it has been quite a day. And in contrast to the gentleman's comments just now, I couldn't get over this text that I received from the mayor of Charlotte, Vi Lyles, about 30 minutes ago. She is a progressive Democrat, a political opponent for years, a tremendous and graceful person. She said:

Representative Bishop, I hope you are safe and well. It must have been a day of anguish for the world to see our Capitol buildings under siege. I know you have a long night ahead and want you to know I was thinking about you, your family, and staff. God bless.

VI.

Back home, the generosity of spirit still exists.

And I understand the sharp words and feelings on the other side tonight, but there are also good people back home, and I have heard from many, many, many of them.

News would suggest there are millions of Americans—that is a big number—millions, tens of millions, who believe something went awry in this election. And they aren't dumb. They aren't mindless. They don't believe things simply because the President says them. There were problems.

I know that Joe Biden will be President, but I don't know that it hurts or would hurt any of us to have the generosity of spirit to continue to reflect on what might be better or what might seriously have gone wrong here, even if you reject the notion that the result was wrong.

I would like to offer a slightly different perspective, a distinct perspective. Perhaps it will be rejected. I think if I were sitting on the other side of the aisle, it would be very difficult for me to listen to tonight, but you all have heard it said, and it certainly is true, that many executive branch officials around the Nation departed from State legislatures' enacted laws.

I know it is less understood how this came to pass.

It was not a spontaneous, independent decisionmaking, but it resulted, I would argue, from a coordinated, nationwide partisan plan. And the fact and scope of the plan really isn't disputed.

If you go to [democracydocket.com](http://democracydocket.com), it is the website of Marc Elias, the national Democratic election lawyer who appeared in hundreds of cases across the country in the course of the election year.

This plan was not a response to COVID, by the way. It preexisted that. And his website shows that as well. He explained that in January of 2020.

It was a chaos strategy, a plan to flood State and Federal courts with hundreds of simultaneous election year

lawsuits aimed at displacing State legislative control.

Now, as I have seen it, only the most experienced and independent judges appear to have recognized what was afoot. In the fourth circuit, dissenting judges Wilkinson and Agee said this: "Let's understand the strategy that is being deployed here . . . Our country is now plagued with a proliferation of preelection litigation." And as they put it, 385 election year cases to that point on October 20, and they referred to the website [healthyelections.org](http://healthyelections.org) to verify that.

"Around the country," they wrote, "courts are changing the rules of the upcoming elections at the last minute. It makes the promise of the Constitution's Elections and Electors Clauses into a farce."

This was a political operation masquerading as a judicial one. And in keeping with that, it featured gross breaches of litigation ethics: forum shopping, repetitive suits after losses, and collusive settlements with cooperating Democratic officials of State and local governments.

That is what led to officials changing the rules in State after State, mainly through consent orders, or the preliminary, unreviewed decisions of State and Federal trial judges inclined by partisanship or having limited experience with the Electoral Clause.

In turn, the displacement of rules set by State legislatures led to chaotic conditions on the ground, about which so many Americans are angry and disheartened.

I think we can do better. I think that strategy was unwise, and I think, particularly in light of what has happened here today, we should.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight in opposition to the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Madam Speaker, as a nation, we have endured trying times and overcome many challenges, and now we face an unprecedented effort to ignore the will of the American people and the people of Arizona. Given the facts and the unprecedented events of tonight, this effort must be finished, and America can be united again. That is going to take leadership.

We are all leaders.

We are elected to be leaders. And if we are going to do that, we have to do it from respect to others, the idea that truth is important, that factual content is important, that we are going to tell the American people what is going on in this country and not what we hope they hear from a 30-second sound bite.

I used to be a homicide investigator. My job was to follow the facts, develop a case, make decisions and recommendations based on where those facts led me. Following the process means that decisions cannot be made on rumors and innuendos alone.

I am proud to say that Arizona has used mail-in voting for over two decades. Both Republicans and Democrats

have long been proud of how our State has administered elections.

In 2020, over 65 percent of eligible Arizonans voted, a record number. Our Republican Governor, Republican attorney general, Democratic secretary of state, and our State's election administrators and volunteers worked with integrity to administer a fair election.

We saw turnout increases in both Republican and Democratic areas, and, in fact, more Republicans registered in this election than any other party. I am proud that many of our Tribal, rural, and underserved communities voted in record numbers, all during a pandemic. In 2020, Arizonans made their voices heard.

The fact is, multiple Federal and State judges, agencies, and State elected officials concluded the winner was Joe Biden.

In Arizona, this process was administered and overseen by officials from both parties. Election officials conducted random, hand-counted audits of many precincts that confirmed there were no errors that would change the result of the election.

The fact is that the Republican chairman of Maricopa County, the largest Republican county in the State, the biggest population county, stated: "More than 2 million ballots were cast in Maricopa County, and there is no evidence of fraud or misconduct or malfunction."

He concluded: "No matter how you voted, this election was administered with integrity, transparency, and in accordance with State laws."

The fact is, the President, his campaign, and several Republican-led groups filed eight election lawsuits, all of which were dismissed. The Arizona Supreme Court, a body where all justices have been appointed by Republican Governors, unanimously dismissed the case.

□ 2215

The justices found that the party had "failed to present any evidence of 'misconduct,' or 'illegal votes' . . . let alone establish any degree of fraud or a significant error rate that would undermine the certainty of the election results."

After these judicial rulings, the Governor said: "I trust our election system. There's integrity in our election system."

The fact is, Joe Biden is the certified winner of Arizona's 11 electoral votes. Arizona's elected and appointed officials from both parties followed the facts and came to this conclusion. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

To my colleagues across the aisle, I know we may disagree on who we want as President, but what we personally want is not what matters here. Rather, the people's influence, as reflected in the certified electoral college results, is what matters. Facts matter.

Undermining faith in our election process by attempting to mislead the

American public only serves to weaken us and make us vulnerable to foreign actors who do us harm. For the good of our country, this must stop. Now is the time to come together to preserve our democracy and to protect our national security.

I know my constituents are looking to Congress to move past its divisions, find common ground, and pass legislation to improve the lives of struggling families. We must stay focused on fighting the pandemic. We must work to ensure all Americans can be vaccinated as soon as possible so we can save American lives, safely reopen schools, get people back to work, and visit loved ones again. I urge my colleagues to follow this.

Mr. GAETZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GAETZ. Madam Speaker, one of the first things we did when the House convened today was to join together to extend our grace and our kindness and our concern for a colleague who has experienced just an insurmountable amount of grief with his family. And I want all of our fellow Americans watching to know that we did that because we care about each other and we don't want bad things to happen to each other, and our heart hurts when they do.

Now, I am sure there are plenty of folks over there who don't like me too much and there are few of them that I don't care for too much. But if anybody had been hurt today, it would have been even more of a catastrophe than we already saw, and I think that is an important point for the country.

Another important point for the country is that this morning, President Trump explicitly called for demonstrations and protests to be peaceful. He was far more—you can moan and groan, but he was far more explicit about his calls for peace than some of the BLM and leftwing rioters were this summer when we saw violence sweep across this Nation.

Now, we came here today to debate, to follow regular order, to offer an objection, to follow a process that is expressly contemplated in our Constitution; and for doing that, we got called a bunch of seditious traitors.

Now, not since 1985 has a Republican President been sworn in absent some Democrat effort to object to the electors; but when we do it, it is the new violation of all norms. And when those things are said, people get angry.

Now, I know there are many countries where political violence may be necessary, but America is not one such country.

Madam Speaker, it was wrong when people vandalized and defaced your home. It was wrong when thugs went to Senator HAWLEY's home. And I don't know if the reports are true, but The Washington Times has just reported some pretty compelling evidence from a facial recognition company showing

that some of the people who breached the Capitol today were not Trump supporters. They were masquerading as Trump supporters, and, in fact, were members of the violent terrorist group antifa.

Now, we should seek to build America up, not tear her down and destroy her. And I am sure glad that, at least for one day, I didn't hear my Democrat colleagues calling to defund the police.

Now, I appreciate all the talk of coming together, but let us not pretend that our colleagues on the left have been free of some antidemocratic impulses. Just because we signed on to legal briefs and asked courts to resolve disputes, there were some on the left who said that we should not even be seated in the body, that we ought to be prosecuted, maybe even jailed. Those arguments anger people.

But people do understand the concepts of basic fairness, and no competition, contest, or election can be deemed fair if the participants are subject to different rules.

Baseball teams that cheat and steal signs should be stripped of their championships. Russian Olympians who cheat and use steroids should be stripped of their medals. And States that do not run clean elections should be stripped of their electors.

This fraud was systemic; it was repeated; it was the same system; and, I dare say, it was effective. We saw circumstances where, when Democrat operatives couldn't get the outcomes they wanted in State legislatures, when they couldn't get the job done there, they went and pressured and litigated and usurped the Constitution with extra-constitutional action of some officials in some States. They fraudulently laundered ballots, votes, voter registration forms, and then they limited review.

In 2016, Democrats found out that they couldn't beat Donald Trump at the ballot box with voters who actually show up, so they turned to impeachment and the witness box. And when that failed, they ran to the mailbox, where this election saw an unprecedented amount of votes that could not be authenticated with true ID, with true signature match, and with true confidence for the American people.

Our Article III courts have failed by not holding evidentiary hearings to weigh the evidence. We should not join in that failure. We should vindicate the rights of States. We should vindicate the subpoenas in Arizona that have been issued to get a hold of these voting machines, and we should reject these electors.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield my time to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), the dean of the Arizona delegation.



Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado for yielding time.

I will be very brief, Madam Speaker. There is really nothing left to say. This challenge brought by Members of this House, Republican Members from this House from Arizona and a Senator from Texas, the whole discussion today, this challenge to the 11 electoral votes that are designated for President Biden and Vice President Harris, the discussion today proves there is no merit to denying those electoral votes. There is no legal standing. The courts have proven that in Arizona time and time again. There is no precedent. There was no constitutional violation.

But we are here today, Madam Speaker, because of one man and those who are desperate to please him.

So what do we have to show for this process today? Fear, a lockdown, violence, and, regrettably and sadly, death, arrests, present and real danger, threats, an assault on our institution, this House, this Congress, and the very democracy that we practice here.

And to what end? What did we accomplish?

The reality is that the challenges will be defeated. Come January 20, President Biden and Vice President Harris will be the President and Vice President of the United States.

So what have we accomplished? To further divide this Nation? To continue to fan the same rhetoric of division and us versus them? To paralyze and dismantle our democracy? Is that what we attempted to accomplish today?

The mob that attacked this institution, I hold no Member specifically responsible for that madness that was around us, but we do share a responsibility, my friends, to end it. It is past time to accept reality, to reaffirm our democracy and move on.

I would urge my colleagues from Arizona who filed this challenge to withdraw their challenge to this, to Arizona and to the electors that have been chosen to give their 11 votes to the winners in that election.

But if that doesn't happen, then I would urge my colleagues to reject this challenge and defend all voters, defend the voters of Arizona and that democracy that we practice daily in the representation of our constituents. That is what is at stake today.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, on Sunday, every Member in this Chamber took an oath to uphold the Constitution, and there is only one vote tonight for those who took that oath, and that vote is to reject this challenge.

The SPEAKER. All time for debate has expired.

The question is, Shall the objection to the Arizona electoral college vote count submitted by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) be agreed to.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 121, nays 303, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

YEAS—121

Aderholt  
Allen  
Arrington  
Babin  
Baird  
Banks  
Bergman  
Bice (OK)  
Biggs  
Bishop (NC)  
Boehert  
Bost  
Brooks  
Budd  
Burchett  
Burgess  
Calvert  
Cammack  
Carl  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Cawthorn  
Cline  
Cloud  
Clyde  
Cole  
Crawford  
Davidson  
DeJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donalds  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Estes  
Fallon  
Fischbach  
Fitzgerald  
Fleischmann  
Franklin, C.  
Scott  
Fulcher

Gaetz  
Garloia (CA)  
Gibbs  
Gimenez  
Gohmert  
Good (VA)  
Gooden (TX)  
Gosar  
Graves (MO)  
Green (TN)  
Greene (GA)  
Griffith  
Guest  
Hagedorn  
Harris  
Harshbarger  
Hartzel  
Hern  
Herrell  
Hice (GA)  
Higgins (LA)  
Hudson  
Issa  
Jackson  
Jacobs (NY)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Jordan  
Joyce (PA)  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
LaTurner  
Lesko  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Mallotakis  
Mann

Mast  
McCarthy  
McClain  
Miller (IL)  
Miller (WV)  
Moore (AL)  
Mullin  
Nehls  
Norman  
Nunes  
Obermole  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Perry  
Pfluger  
Posey  
Rescenhthaler  
Rice (SC)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rose  
Rosenwald  
Rouzer  
Rutherford  
Scalise  
Sessions  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Steube  
Tiffany  
Timmons  
Van Drew  
Walberg  
Walorski  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Williams (TX)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wright  
Zeldin

NAYS—303

Adams  
Aguilar  
Alfred  
Amodei  
Armstrong  
Auchincloss  
Axne  
Bacon  
Balderson  
Barr  
Barragán  
Bass  
Beatty  
Benz  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Bourdeaux  
Bowman  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brown  
Brownley  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Bush  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson  
Cartwright  
Case  
Casten  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chabot  
Cheney  
Chu

Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Comer  
Connolly  
Cooper  
Correa  
Costa  
Courtney  
Craig  
Crenshaw  
Crist  
Crow  
Cuellar  
Curtis  
Davids (KS)  
Davis, Danny K.  
Davis, Rodney  
Dean  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Delgado  
Demings  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Emmer  
Escobar  
Eshoo  
Español  
Evans  
Feenstra  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fletcher

Fortenberry  
Foster  
Fox  
Frankel, Lois  
Fudge  
Gallagher  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garbarino  
Garloia (IL)  
Garloia (TX)  
Golden  
Gomez  
Gonzales, Tony  
Gonzalez (OH)  
Gonzalez,  
Vicente  
Gottschmer  
Graves (LA)  
Green, Al (TX)  
Grijalva  
Grothman  
Guthrie  
Haaland  
Harder (CA)  
Hayes  
Herrera Beutler  
Higgins (NY)  
Hill  
Himes  
Hinson  
Hollingsworth  
Horsford  
Houlahan  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Huizenga  
Jackson Lee  
Jacobs (CA)  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (SD)

Johnson (TX)  
Jones  
Joyce (OH)  
Kahala  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Keating  
Keller  
Kelly (IL)  
Khanna  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kim (NJ)  
Kind  
Kinzinger  
Kirkpatrick  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster  
Kustoff  
LaHood  
Lamb  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latta  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee (CA)  
Lee (NV)  
Leger Fernandez  
Levin (CA)  
Levin (MI)  
Lileu  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Luria  
Lynch  
Mace  
Malinowski  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Manning  
Massie  
Matsui  
McBath  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meijer  
Meng  
Meuser  
Mfume  
Miller-Meeks

Moolenaar  
Mooney  
Moore (UT)  
Moore (WI)  
Morelle  
Moulton  
Mrvan  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (NC)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neguse  
Newhouse  
Newman  
Norcross  
O'Halleran  
Ocasio-Cortez  
Omar  
Owens  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pappas  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Phillips  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Porter  
Pressley  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Reed  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rodgers (WA)  
Ross  
Roy  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schriner  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David

Sewell  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Simpson  
Stres  
Slotkin  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Smucker  
Soto  
Spanberger  
Spartz  
Speier  
Stanton  
Staubert  
Stefanik  
Steil  
Stevens  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Strickland  
Suzuki  
Swalwell  
Takano  
Taylor  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Torres (NY)  
Trahan  
Trone  
Turner  
Underwood  
Upton  
Van Deyne  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Wagner  
Waltz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Wexton  
Wild  
Williams (GA)  
Wilson (FL)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Yarmuth  
Young

NOT VOTING—7

Hill  
Hastings  
Kim (CA)  
Steel

□ 2308

Messrs. MOONEY, WITTMAN, VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, YOUNG, and GROTHMAN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. JOHNSON of Ohio, RESCENHALER, and Mrs. WALORSKI changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the objection was not agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mrs. KIM of California. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 10.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will now notify the Senate of the action of the House, informing that body that the House is now ready to proceed in joint session with the further counting of the electoral vote for the President and the Vice President.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. To remind both sides of the aisle, during in the joint session, there are 11 House Republicans, 11 House Democrats, 11 House Senate Democrats, 11 Senate Republicans, 44 Members on the floor. Please view the proceedings from your offices. Thank you.

This is not a suggestion. That is a direction, in the interest of good example to the public of how serious we take the coronavirus threat and the need for social distancing.

Please, my colleagues, if you are not participating in the next part of this, please return to your offices.

I wish to remind Members that we have to reduce the number of Members on the floor to the gallery to witness the proceedings from there, in a relative number. So first come, first serve.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Secretary of the Senate shall inform the House of Representatives that the Senate is ready to proceed in joint session with the further counting of the electoral votes for President and Vice President.

At 11:35 p.m., the Sergeant at Arms, Paul D. Irving, announced the Vice President and the Senate of the United States.

The Senate entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, headed by the Vice President and the Secretary of the Senate, the Members and officers of the House rising to receive them.

The Vice President took his seat as the Presiding Officer of the joint convention of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House occupying the chair on his left. Senators took seats to the right of the rostrum as prescribed by law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint session of Congress to count the electoral vote will resume. The tellers will take their chairs.

The two Houses retired to consider separately and decide upon the vote of the State of Arizona, to which an objection has been filed.

The Secretary of the Senate will report the action of the Senate.

The Secretary of the Senate read the order of the Senate, as follows:

*Ordered*, That the Senate by a vote of 6 ayes to 93 nays rejects the objection to the electoral votes cast in the State of Arizona for Joseph R. Biden, Jr., for President and KAMALA D. HARRIS for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Clerk of the House will report the action of the House.

The Clerk of the House read the order of the House, as follows:

*Ordered*, That the House of Representatives rejects the objection to the electoral vote of the State of Arizona.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to the law, chapter 1 of title 3, United States Code, because the two Houses have not sustained the objection, the original certificate submitted by the

State of Arizona will be counted as provided therein.

The tellers will now record and announce the vote of the State of Arkansas for President and Vice President in accordance with the action of the two Houses.

This certificate from Arkansas, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from that State, and purports to be a return from the State, and that has annexed to it a certificate from an authority of that State purporting to appoint or ascertain electors.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Arkansas seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Donald J. Trump of the State of Florida received 6 votes for President and MICHAEL R. PENCE of the State of Indiana received 6 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of vote of the State of Arkansas that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from California, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate from an authority of the State purporting to appoint and ascertain electors.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of California seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Joseph R. Biden, Jr., of the State of Delaware received 55 votes for President and KAMALA D. HARRIS of the State of California received 55 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of vote of the State of California that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from Colorado, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State, and that has annexed to it a certificate from an authority of the State purporting to appoint and ascertain electors.

Senator BLUNT. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Colorado seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Joseph R. Biden, Jr., of the State of Delaware received 9 votes for President and KAMALA D. HARRIS of the State of California received 9 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of vote of the State of Colorado that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from Connecticut, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate from an authority of the State purporting to appoint or ascertain electors.

Senator KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Connecticut seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Joseph R. Biden, Jr., of the State of Delaware received 7 votes for President and KAMALA D. HARRIS of the State of California received 7 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of vote of the State of Connecticut that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

□ 2345

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from Delaware, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate from an authority of the State purporting to appoint and ascertain electors.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Delaware seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Joseph R. Biden, Jr., of the State of Delaware received 3 votes for President and KAMALA D. HARRIS of the State of California received 3 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of vote of the State of Delaware that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from the District of Columbia, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from the District that purports to be a return from the District and that has annexed to it a certificate from an authority of the District purporting to appoint and ascertain electors.

Senator BLUNT. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the District of Columbia seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Joseph R. Biden, Jr., of the State of Delaware received 3 votes for President and KAMALA D. HARRIS of the State of California received 3 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of vote of the District of Columbia that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from Florida, the



Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate from an authority of the State purporting to appoint and ascertain electors.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Florida seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Donald J. Trump of the State of Florida received 29 votes for President and MICHAEL R. PENCE of the State of Indiana received 29 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of vote of the State of Florida that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from Georgia, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate from an authority of the State purporting to appoint and ascertain electors.

Senator KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Georgia seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Joseph R. Biden, Jr., of the State of Delaware received 16 votes for President and KAMALA D. HARRIS of the State of California received 16 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. For what purpose does the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE) rise?

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. President, myself, members of the Georgia delegation, and some 74 of my Republican colleagues and I object to the electoral vote from the State of Georgia on the grounds that the election conducted on November 3 was faulty and fraudulent due to unilateral actions by the secretary of state to unlawfully change the State's election process without approval from the General Assembly and thereby setting the stage for an unprecedented amount of fraud and irregularities. I have signed the objection myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sections 15 and 17 of title 3, United States Code, require that any objection be presented in writing and signed by a Member of the House of Representatives and a Senator.

Is the objection in writing and signed by a Member and a Senator?

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. President, prior to the actions and events of today, we did, but following the events of today, it appears that some Senators have withdrawn their objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In that case, the objection cannot be entertained.

This certificate from Hawaii, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from

the State and that has annexed to it a certificate from an authority of the State purporting to appoint and ascertain electors.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Hawaii seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Joseph R. Biden, Jr., of the State of Delaware received 4 votes for President and KAMALA D. HARRIS of the State of California received 4 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of vote of the State of Hawaii that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from Idaho, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate from an authority of the State purporting to appoint and ascertain electors.

Senator BLUNT. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Idaho seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Donald J. Trump of the State of Florida received 4 votes for President and MICHAEL R. PENCE of the State of Indiana received 4 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of vote of the State of Idaho that the teller has certified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from Illinois, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate from an authority of the State purporting to appoint and ascertain electors.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Illinois seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Joseph R. Biden, Jr., of the State of Delaware received 20 votes for President and KAMALA D. HARRIS of the State of California received 20 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of vote of the State of Illinois that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from Indiana, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate from an authority of the State purporting to appoint and ascertain electors.

Senator KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Indiana seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Donald J. Trump of the State of Florida received 11 votes for President and MICHAEL R. PENCE of the State of Indiana received 11 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of vote of the State of Indiana that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from Iowa, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate from an authority of the State purporting to appoint and ascertain electors.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Iowa seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Donald J. Trump of the State of Florida received 6 votes for President and MICHAEL R. PENCE of the State of Indiana received 6 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of vote of the State of Iowa that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from Kansas, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate from an authority of the State purporting to appoint and ascertain electors.

Senator BLUNT. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Kansas seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Donald J. Trump of the State of Florida received 6 votes for President and MICHAEL R. PENCE of the State of Indiana received 6 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of vote of the State of Kansas that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from the Commonwealth of Kentucky, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate from an authority of the State purporting to appoint and ascertain electors.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the Commonwealth of Kentucky seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Donald J.



Trump of the State of Florida received 8 votes for President and MICHAEL R. PENCE of the State of Indiana received 8 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of vote of the Commonwealth of Kentucky that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from Louisiana, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate from an authority of the State purporting to appoint and ascertain electors.

Senator KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Louisiana seems to be regular in form and authentic, and appears therefrom that Donald J. Trump of the State of Florida received 8 votes for President and MICHAEL R. PENCE of the State of Indiana received 8 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of vote of the State of Louisiana that the teller has verified to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from Maine, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate from an authority of the State purporting to appoint and ascertain electors.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Maine seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Joseph R. Biden, Jr., of the State of Delaware received 3 votes for President, and Donald J. Trump of the State of Florida received 1 vote for President and KAMALA D. HARRIS of the State of California received 3 votes for Vice President, and MICHAEL R. PENCE of the State of Indiana received 1 vote for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of vote of the State of Maine that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from Maryland, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate from an authority of the State purporting to appoint and ascertain electors.

Senator BLUNT. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Maryland seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Joseph R. Biden, Jr., of the State of Delaware received 10 votes

for President and KAMALA D. HARRIS of the State of California received 10 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of vote of the State of Maryland that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from Massachusetts, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate from an authority of the State purporting to appoint and ascertain electors.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. President, the certificate of electoral vote of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Joseph R. Biden, Jr., of the State of Delaware received 11 votes for President and KAMALA D. HARRIS of the State of California received 11 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of vote of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from Michigan, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate from an authority of the State purporting to appoint and ascertain electors.

Senator KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Michigan seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Joseph R. Biden, Jr., of the State of Delaware received 16 votes for President and KAMALA D. HARRIS of the State of California received 16 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. For what reason does the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. GREENE) rise?

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. President, I, along with 70 of my Republican colleagues, object to the counting of the electoral votes for the State of Michigan on the grounds that the error rate exceeds the FEC rate allowed at 0.0008 percent, and that the people who signed affidavits at risk of perjury, their voices have not been heard in a court of law.

□ 0000

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sections 15 and 17 of title 3 of the U.S. Code, require that any objection be presented in writing and signed by a Member of the House of Representatives and a Senator.

Is the objection in writing and signed by a Member and a Senator?

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. The objection is in writing, not signed by a Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In that case, the objection cannot be entertained.

Are there any further objections to counting the certificate of the vote from the State of Michigan that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing no further objections, this certificate from Minnesota, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate of an authority of the State purporting to appoint or ascertain electors.

Senator KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Minnesota seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Joseph R. Biden, Jr., of the State of Delaware received 10 votes for President and KAMALA D. HARRIS of the State of California received 10 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of the vote from the State of Minnesota that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from Mississippi, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate of an authority of the State purporting to appoint or ascertain electors.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Mississippi seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Donald J. Trump of the State of Florida received 6 votes for President and MICHAEL R. PENCE of the State of Indiana received 6 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of the vote from the State of Mississippi that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from Missouri, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate of an authority of the State purporting to appoint or ascertain electors.

Senator BLUNT. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Missouri seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Donald J. Trump of the State of Florida received 10 votes for President and MICHAEL R. PENCE of the State of Indiana received 10 votes for Vice President.



The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of the vote from the State of Missouri that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from Montana, the Parliamentarians have advised, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate of an authority of the State purporting to appoint or ascertain electors.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Montana seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Donald J. Trump from the State of Florida received 3 votes for President and MICHAEL R. PENCE from the State of Indiana received 3 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of the vote from the State of Montana that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from Nebraska, the Parliamentarians have advised, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate of an authority of the State purporting to appoint or ascertain electors.

Senator KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Nebraska seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Donald J. Trump of the State of Florida received 4 votes for President; and Joseph R. Biden, Jr., of the State of Delaware received 1 vote for President; and MICHAEL R. PENCE of the State of Indiana received 4 votes for Vice President; and KAMALA D. HARRIS of the State of California received 1 vote for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of vote from the State of Nebraska that the teller has verified is regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from Nevada, the Parliamentarians have advised, is the only certificate of vote from the State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate of an authority from the State purporting to appoint or ascertain electors.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Nevada seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Joseph R. Biden, Jr., of the State of Delaware received 4 votes for President and KAMALA D. HARRIS of the State of Cali-

fornia received 6 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. For what purpose does the gentleman from Alabama rise?

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. President, I and 55 other Members of the United States House of Representatives object to the electoral vote for the State of Nevada in order to protect the lawful votes of Nevada and all other American citizens.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sections 15 and 17 of title 3 of the United States Code, require that any objection be presented in writing and signed by a Member of the House of Representatives and a Senator.

Is the objection in writing and signed by a Member and a Senator?

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. President, it is in writing, but, unfortunately, no United States Senator has joined in this effort.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In that case, the objection cannot be entertained.

Are there any further objections to counting the certificate of vote from the State of Nevada that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This certificate from New Hampshire, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of electoral vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate of an authority of the State purporting to appoint or ascertain electors.

Senator BLUNT. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of New Hampshire seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Joseph R. Biden, Jr., of the State of Delaware received 4 votes for President and KAMALA D. HARRIS of the State of California received 4 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of vote of the State of New Hampshire that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This certificate from New Jersey, the Parliamentarians have advised, is the only certificate of vote from the State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate of an authority in the State purporting to appoint or ascertain electors.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of New Jersey seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Joseph R. Biden, Jr., of the State of Delaware received 14 votes for President and KAMALA D. HARRIS of the State of California received 14 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of the vote from the State of New

Jersey that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This certificate from New Mexico, the Parliamentarians have advised, is the only certificate of vote from the State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate of an authority of the State purporting to appoint or ascertain electors.

Senator KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of New Mexico seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Joseph R. Biden, Jr., of the State of Delaware received 5 votes for President and KAMALA D. HARRIS of the State of California received 5 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of the vote from the State of New Mexico that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from New York, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from the State that purports to be a return from the State and has annexed to it a certificate of an authority from the State purporting to appoint or ascertain electors.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of New York seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Joseph R. Biden, Jr., of the State of Delaware received 29 votes for President and KAMALA D. HARRIS of the State of California received 29 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of the vote from the State of New York that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from North Carolina, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate from the State purporting to appoint or ascertain electors.

□ 0010

Senator BLUNT. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of North Carolina seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Donald J. Trump of the State of Florida received 15 votes for President and MICHAEL R. PENCE of the State of Indiana received 15 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of vote of the State of North Carolina that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?



There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from North Dakota, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from that State, and purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate of an authority of the State purporting to appoint and ascertain electors.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of North Dakota seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Donald J. Trump of the State of Florida received 3 votes for President and MICHAEL R. PENCE of the State of Indiana received 3 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of vote of the State of North Dakota that the teller has verified as regular and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, the certificate from Ohio, the Parliamentarians have advised, is the only certificate of vote from that State, and purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate of an authority of the State purporting to appoint or ascertain electors.

Senator KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Ohio seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Donald J. Trump of the State of Florida received 18 votes for President and MICHAEL R. PENCE of the State of Indiana received 18 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of vote of the State of Ohio that the teller has verified is regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from Oklahoma, the Parliamentarians have advised, is the only certificate of vote from that State, and purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate of an authority of the State purporting to appoint or ascertain electors.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Oklahoma seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Donald J. Trump of the State of Florida received 7 votes for President and MICHAEL R. PENCE of the State of Indiana received 7 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of vote of the State of Oklahoma that the teller has verified to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from Oregon, the Parliamentarians have advised, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the

State and that has a certificate of authority from the State annexed to it to appoint and ascertain electors.

Senator BLUNT. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Oregon seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Joseph R. Biden, Jr., of the State of Delaware received 7 votes for President and KAMALA D. HARRIS of the State of California received 7 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of vote of the State of Oregon that the teller has verified as regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Parliamentarians have advised, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate from an authority of the State purporting to appoint and ascertain electors.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Joseph R. Biden, Jr., of the State of Delaware received 20 votes for President and KAMALA D. HARRIS of the State of California received 20 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. PERRY. Mr. President, sadly, but resolutely, I object to the electoral votes of my beloved Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on the grounds of multiple constitutional infractions that they were not under all of the known circumstances regularly given; and on this occasion, I have a written objection signed by a Senator and 80 Members of the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the objection in writing and signed by a Senator?

Mr. PERRY. Yes, Mr. Vice President, it is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. An objection presented in writing and signed by both a Representative and a Senator complies with the law, chapter 1 of title 3, United States Code.

The Clerk will report the objection.

The Clerk read the objection as follows:

JANUARY 7, 2021.

We, a United States Senator and Members of the House of Representatives, object to the counting of the electoral votes of the State of Pennsylvania on the ground that they were not, under all of the known circumstances, regularly given.

JOSH HAWLEY,  
United States Senator.  
SCOTT PERRY,  
Member of Congress.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mo Brooks AL-5, Mike Kelly PA-16, John Joyce PA-13, Fred Keller PA-12, Scott Perry PA-10, Glenn Thompson PA-15, Jim Jordan

OH-4, Dan Meuser PA-9, Clay Higgins LA-3, Tom Rice SC-7, Yvette Herrell NM-2, Alexander Mooney WV-2, Andy Biggs AZ-5, John W. Rose TN-6, W. Greg Steube FL-17, Madison Cawthorn NC-11, Bill Posey FL-8, Jeff Duncan SC-3, Brian Babin TX-36, Louie Gohmert TX-1.

Brian J. Mast FL-18, Warren Davidson OH-8, Andy Harris MD-1, Doug Lamborn CO-5, Kat Cammack FL-3, Tracey Mann KS-1, Bob Good VA-5, Adrian Smith NE-3, Billy Long MO-7, Jack Bergman MI-1, Michael Cloud TX-27, Byron Donalds FL-19, Rick Crawford AR-1, Roger Williams TX-25, Bob Gibbs OH-7, Russ Fulcher ID-1, Richard Hudson NC-8, Ted Budd NC-13, Barry Moore AL-2, Lee Zeldin NY-1.

Jake LaTurner KS-2, David Rouzer NC-7, Jason Smith MO-8, Lauren Boebert CO-3, Paul A. Gosar AZ-4, Chuck Fleischmann TN-3, Tim Burchett TN-2, Chris Jacobs NY-27, Bill Johnson OH-6, Andrew S. Clyde GA-9, Lance Gooden TX-5, Randy Feenstra IA-4, Mary E. Miller IL-15, Diana Harshbarger TN-1, Mark E. Green TN-7, Ron Estes KS-4, Neal Dunn FL-2, Ronny Jackson TX-13, Elise Stefanik NY-21, Ralph Norman SC-5.

Joe Wilson SC-2, Vicky Hartzler MO-4, Scott DesJarlais TN-4, Marjorie Taylor Greene GA-14, Doug LaMalfa CA-1, Jeff Van Drew NJ-2, Ben Cline VA-6, Michael D. Rogers AL-3, Markwayne Mullin OK-2, Jeff Duncan SC-3, Pat Fallon TX-4, Brad R. Wenstrup OH-2, August Pfluger TX-11, Rob Wittman VA-1, Scott Franklin FL-15, David Kustoff TN-8, Sam Graves MO-6, Matt Gaetz FL-1, Randy K. Weber TX-14.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there further objections to the certificate from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hears none.

The two Houses will withdraw from joint session. Each House will deliberate separately on the pending objection and report its decision back to the joint session.

The Senate will now retire to its Chamber.

The Senate retired to its Chamber.

□ 0020

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 1 and section 17 of title 3, United States Code, when the two Houses withdraw from the joint session to count the electoral vote for separate consideration of objection, a Representative may speak to the objection for 5 minutes and not more than once. Debate shall not exceed 2 hours, after which the Chair shall put the question, Shall the objection be agreed to?

The Clerk will report the objection made in the joint session.

The Clerk read the objection as follows:

JANUARY 7, 2021.

We, a United States Senator and Members of the House of Representatives, object to the counting of the electoral votes of the State of Pennsylvania on the ground that they were not, under all of the known circumstances, regularly given.

JOSH HAWLEY,  
United States Senator.  
SCOTT PERRY,  
Member of Congress.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mo Brooks AL-5, Mike Kelly PA-16, John Joyce PA-13, Fred Keller PA-12, Scott Perry



PA-10, Glenn Thompson PA-15, Jim Jordan OH-4, Dan Meuser PA-9, Clay Higgins LA-3, Tom Rice SC-7, Yvette Herrell NM-2, Alexander Mooney WV-2, Andy Biggs AZ-5, John W. Rose TN-6, W. Greg Steube FL-17, Madison Cawthorn NC-11, Bill Posey FL-8, Jeff Duncan SC-3, Brian Babin TX-36, Louie Gohmert TX-1.

Brian J. Mast FL-18, Warren Davidson OH-8, Andy Harris MD-1, Doug Lamborn CO-5, Kat Cammack FL-3, Tracey Mann KS-1, Bob Good VA-5, Adrian Smith NE-3, Billy Long MO-7, Jack Bergman MI-1, Michael Cloud TX-27, Byron Donalds FL-19, Rick Crawford AR-1, Roger Williams TX-25, Bob Gibbs OH-7, Russ Fulcher ID-1, Richard Hudson NC-8, Ted Budd NC-13, Barry Moore AL-2, Lee Zeldin NY-1.

Jake LaTurner KS-2, David Rouzer NC-7, Jason Smith MO-8, Lauren Boebert CO-3, Paul A. Gosar AZ-4, Chuck Fleischmann TN-3, Tim Burchett TN-2, Chris Jacobs NY-27, Bill Johnson OH-6, Andrew S. Clyde GA-9, Lance Gooden TX-5, Randy Feenstra IA-4, Mary E. Miller IL-15, Diana Harshbarger TN-1, Mark E. Green TN-7, Ron Estes KS-4, Neal Dunn FL-2, Ronny Jackson TX-13, Elise Stefanik NY-21, Ralph Norman SC-5.

Joe Wilson SC-2, Vicky Hartzler MO-4, Scott DesJarlais TN-4, Marjorie Taylor Greene GA-14, Doug LaMalfa CA-1, Jeff Van Drew NJ-2, Ben Cline VA-6, Michael D. Rogers AL-3, Markwayne Mullin OK-2, Pat Fallon TX-4, Brad R. Wenstrup OH-2, August Pfluger TX-11, Rob Wittman VA-1, Scott Franklin FL-15, David Kustoff TN-8, Sam Graves MO-6, Matt Gaetz FL-1, Randy K. Weber TX-14.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will endeavor to alternate recognition between Members speaking in support of the objection and Members speaking in opposition to the objection.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, this is a somber day for the defense of the Constitution. You see, the Constitution is just a piece of paper. It cannot defend itself. That is why our leaders swear an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution, and that is what I am doing here this evening.

The Constitution states: "The times, places, and manner of holding elections . . . shall be prescribed . . . by the legislature"—not the courts, not the Governor, not the secretary of state or other bureaucrats or elected officials, the legislature.

In Pennsylvania, the supreme court unilaterally extended the deadline for ballots to 3 days after the election. They actually wanted 10. The supreme court is not the legislature. The supreme court mandated un-postmarked ballots to be received, destroying the validity of all the votes that were cast timely.

The supreme court action defied the law, the legislature, and the will of the people.

The supreme court authorized the use of drop boxes, where ballot harvesting could occur. The legislature never authorized that form of voting, and the court had absolutely no right to do so.

Responding to the secretary of state, Kathy Boockvar, the supreme court ruled that mail-in ballots need not authenticate signatures.

Once again, the court not only defied the Constitution and the will of the people, but by so doing, they created a separate class of voters, thereby violating the Equal Protection Clause prescribed in the Constitution.

How can we have two legally separate classes of voters? Yet, the court made it so, not the legislature.

The Constitution doesn't mention the court when determining the time, place, and manner of elections because they are not authorized to make those decisions. Yet, they did it.

And the U.S. Supreme Court has refused to hear the case, denying the evidence and denying the demands for justice from the people of Pennsylvania and America.

These aren't my opinions. These aren't partisan viewpoints. These are irrefutable facts.

Six days before the election, guidance emailed from the secretary of state required that the counties shall not pre-canvass or canvass any mail-in or civilian absentee ballots received between 8 o'clock Tuesday and 5 o'clock Friday and that they must be kept separately. That was 6 days before the election.

Madam Speaker, 2 days before the election, counties received new guidance from the secretary of state, informing counties that they shall canvass segregated absentee and mail-in ballots as soon as possible upon receipt.

The secretary of state is not elected by the people. She is not a member of the legislature. Yet, she, and she alone, determined the time and manner of elections. That was unconstitutional.

In defiance of a U.S. Supreme Court order that all ballots received after election day be segregated, the secretary of state knew, once they were canvassed, that is opened and commingled with all the other ballots, they would be counted with all the rest.

And what is the remedy for this defiance, for this lawbreaking? So far, the court has decided there is no remedy. There is no penalty for this lawlessness, this dilution of lawfully cast votes, this defiance of the Constitution—no remedy. When the State legislature requested the Governor to convene a special session to address the unanswered questions and try to provide a remedy, he refused.

When votes are accepted under unconstitutional means without fair and equal protection for all, the only result can be an illegitimate outcome—illegitimate.

The voters did not create this mess, but the will of the people is absolutely being subverted by the deliberate and willful actions of individuals defying their oath, the law, and the Constitution.

In Pennsylvania, we use the Statewide Uniform Registry of Electors, or SURE, system as the basis of determining who can vote. Unfortunately, a recent attempted audit by the Democrat State auditor general concluded

that he was unable to establish with any degree of reasonable assurance that the SURE system is secure and that Pennsylvania voter registration records are complete and accurate.

That is what we are relying on. That right there. This is the very same system used to certify the election in the contest for President of the United States. This is the very same system that the State used to certify the 2020 election, even though its figures do not match more than half of Pennsylvania's 67 counties.

To this day, right now, while we stand here, how can this election be certified using a system that after 2 months still displays that over 205,000 more votes were cast in Pennsylvania than people who voted in the November election? Let me say that again: 205,000 more votes than voters.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Speaker, to my colleague from Pennsylvania, I will say this: I carry the same Constitution that you do. And the Constitution, sir, does not allow you, me, or any Member of this body to substitute our judgment for that of the American people. It does not allow us to disregard the will of the American people. Because under this Constitution, under our Constitution, Congress doesn't choose the President. The American people do. And they have chosen in resounding numbers, as every single Member of this body well understands.

Madam Speaker, I have been at a loss to explain what happened today, but there is a statement that I found that largely summarized my thoughts on the matter.

"The scenes of mayhem unfolding at the seat of our Nation's government" are a "sickening and heartbreaking sight. This is how election results are disputed in a banana republic, not our democratic Republic. I am appalled by the reckless behavior of some political leaders since the election and by the lack of respect shown today for our institutions, our traditions, and our law enforcement. The violent assault on the Capitol, and the disruption of a constitutionally mandated meeting of Congress, was undertaken by people whose passions have been inflamed by falsehoods and false hopes. Insurrection could do grave damage to our Nation and our reputation."

"In the United States of America, it is the fundamental responsibility of every patriotic citizen to support the rule of law. To those who are disappointed in the results of the election: Our country is more important than the politics of the moment."

□ 0030

Those are not my words. Those are the words of former Republican President George W. Bush.

To my colleagues, it is after midnight tonight. It has been a long day

for our country, a long day for our Republic.

Let us dispense with this. Let's do the right thing. Let's honor our oath. Let's certify the results, and let's get back to the work of the American people.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, our duty today is significant but straightforward. We must count the votes of the electors as cast in the electoral college and announce the results.

As discussed, our roles and responsibilities are established by the Constitution and Federal law, and they are clear. The facts before us are also clear. Pennsylvania submitted one slate of electors, as chosen by the voters of the State. The slate was certified according to State law. Now those lawful results must be counted and announced.

Despite disinformation and any number of false claims that you may have heard, including here today, as former Attorney General Barr said: "We have not seen fraud on a scale that could have effected a different outcome in the election."

This is not simply a conclusory statement. The results of the election have been litigated. The record is clear: The lawsuits challenging the election results failed. They failed because there is simply no evidence to support these baseless claims.

Now, it is one thing to tweet a belief, quite another to provide actual evidence. These cases failed because there is no evidence. Judges ruled in the lawsuits that the 2020 election was sound.

It should come as no surprise that Republican officeholders have recognized the election results as legitimate and accurately determined in an election that was conducted safely, securely, and with integrity.

We all take an oath to support and defend the Constitution. As we near the end of the task before us, let's remember the beginning of the Constitution. Before Article II and the 12th Amendment, which spell out the electoral college, and before Article I, which creates Congress, the Constitution begins with the preamble. The preamble is short and bold: "We the people."

The people spoke in historic numbers. Their votes have been counted. Their choice is clear. It is time, as the law requires, to announce the state of the people's vote.

The violence and disorder inflicted on our democracy by seditious rioters today is an indication of why adherence to our Constitution is so vital.

I urge all of us to stand up for law, for democracy, for our Constitution, and to stand up for America and reject this objection.

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, a day that was intended to debate the importance of election integrity and the rule of law tragically became a day that will be a black mark in our Nation's history. Nevertheless, the work of this House must go on, as America will go on.

We must all sincerely thank the Capitol Police and Metro Police for their selfless actions today, putting their safety and lives on the line to protect this House. The lawlessness and violence of today must be condemned, just as all violent protests must be condemned.

Nevertheless, the fact remains, a large number of Pennsylvanians are enormously frustrated with actions taken by elected and appointed officials in Pennsylvania, which have led to a high level of distrust for this past election.

We have the United States Constitution, which is the reason we have been and will continue to be a great country and a country of laws.

The U.S. Constitution is unambiguous, Madam Speaker, in declaring that State legislatures are the entity with the authority to set election procedures and to enact any changes to election law. Article I, Section 4, Clause 1 states: "The times, places, and manner of holding elections . . . shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof."

The authority of election procedures lies with the State legislature, period.

In Pennsylvania, this authority was indisputably usurped by the Pennsylvania Governor's office, by the Pennsylvania secretary of state, and by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court.

These unlawful actions include, but are not limited to, accepting ballots past 8 p.m. on election day; inconsistent application of verified signature requirements for in-person ballots versus mail-in ballots; authorizing the curing of mail-in ballots with less than 24 hours' notice, leading to inconsistent preparedness between counties; and authorizing the use of unsecured drop boxes, which is not permitted in statute.

If such unlawful actions are to be accepted, what do we have to look forward to next year? The Pennsylvania secretary of state allowing online voting because it may be raining in Philadelphia? It was a free-for-all.

Madam Speaker, it was back in 2005 when then-Minority Leader PELOSI, while leading 31 Democrats as they objected to the Presidential elector certification, as they did in the last three Presidential elections when a Republican won, stated quite well, actually:

The Members of Congress have brought this challenge and are speaking up for their aggrieved constituents, many of whom have been disenfranchised in this process. This is their only opportunity to have this debate while the country is listening, and it is appropriate to do so.

Thank you for those words, Madam Speaker. They were appropriate then, as they are now.

If there is an American ideal that all citizens, regardless of party affiliation, can agree upon, it is that we must have election integrity. We should not certify these electors, which were derived by unlawful actions and a result of inaccurate vote tallies.

Madam Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE).

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the objection.

Tonight, my heart is heavy as we consider the dark acts that transpired in this Chamber today. But, Madam Speaker, the American people can be assured that violent and irrational attacks on this body cannot derail the constitutional responsibility that lies in front of us.

This has always been about upholding the law. It has always been about protecting government of, by, and for the people. Preserving the rule of law is more important than ever.

We must acknowledge that unconstitutional acts unduly impacted the Presidential election in Pennsylvania. Contrary to law, the supreme court extended the deadline for mail-in ballots for 3 days beyond the election day. Contrary to law, the secretary of the Commonwealth discarded mail-in ballot signature verification safeguards. These leaders took advantage of a deadly pandemic and seized the State legislature's rightful authority.

I took an oath to uphold the law and defend the Constitution. I pledged to protect free and fair elections. I cannot, in good faith, certify electors that were selected under an unlawful process.

I will object to the electoral college certification to protect the will of Pennsylvania voters, to uphold the law, to restore trust in our electoral system, and, ultimately, to save our Constitution.

At Gettysburg, which is in my district, President Abraham Lincoln spoke about the great task of ensuring government by, of, and for the people shall not perish from the Earth.

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, nearly 7 million Pennsylvanians showed up to vote in the 2020 elections. They cast their votes for Democrats and Republicans up and down the ballot, including the entire U.S. House delegation, the entire State house, half of the State senate, and other State and local races.

Since the election, there have been allegations of widespread election fraud in Pennsylvania; but, remarkably, the 20 suits filed by the Trump campaign, Pennsylvania Republicans, and others challenging the results in Pennsylvania have never claimed that there was voter fraud.



□ 0040

Perhaps that is because attorneys could lose their licenses when they make unsubstantiated claims in court. That is where the rubber really meets the road.

So if these lawsuits didn't claim election fraud, what did they claim?

Most of the legal challenges to the Presidential election in Pennsylvania question relatively small numbers of ballots that were allegedly tainted by technical violations. Even assuming that all of these ballots had been cast for Joe Biden, throwing them out wouldn't have changed the result of the election.

Now, one exception is the lawsuit filed by one of our colleagues from Pennsylvania, *Kelly v. Commonwealth*, which would have thrown out all the mail-in votes cast in the 2020 general election on the grounds that Act 77, the State law allowing those votes, was unconstitutional. That suit would have disenfranchised 2½ million Pennsylvanians. Let's let that sink in, 2½ million Pennsylvanians would have had their votes nullified.

Now, I want to provide my colleagues with some background about the State law at the heart of this challenge. In 2019, the Republican-controlled State legislature approved Act 77, a bipartisan bill to reform the State's election laws, which instituted no-excuse mail balloting. Act 77 was supported almost unanimously by Republicans in the State House and State Senate. In fact, it was unanimous in the State Senate and all but two Republicans in the State House.

Moreover, once this Act was passed, Act 77 had a 120-day period where challenges could be filed against the Act if people thought it was unconstitutional. Well, 4 months went by, nobody files a challenge. On June 3, Pennsylvania had their primary under this new system. Nobody challenged the primary election. It was only challenged in November, when Republicans didn't get the result they wanted at the top of the ticket. Not surprisingly, this case was dismissed by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court and an appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court was denied.

Another exception is *Texas v. Pennsylvania*. They asked the court to reject the results of the Pennsylvania Presidential contest in Pennsylvania and several other States, disenfranchising tens of millions of the voters. Seven Republican members of the Pennsylvania U.S. House delegation signed the U.S. House Republican brief in support of *Texas v. Pennsylvania*.

While I feel compelled to point out to my colleagues that the same voters who sent them to the 117th Congress cast their votes for the President by marking the very same ballots, which were read by the very same ballot scanners and monitored by the very same election workers. Yet our colleagues who signed the brief only want to invalidate the Presidential votes. This is

illogical and inconsistent, colleagues, and I am pleased to note that the Supreme Court rejected it as well.

The fact is, the election has received unprecedented scrutiny in the courts. I believe it is irresponsible and undemocratic to argue today that the U.S. Congress ought to relitigate the 2020 Presidential election and second-guess the will of the voters in multiple States, the decisions of numerous State and Federal courts, including the Supreme Court, and the counts and recounts conducted by State election officials.

There were 20 lawsuits filed in Pennsylvania challenging aspects of the Presidential election. In 19 of them you got laughed out of court. The one case you won affected roughly 100 votes. Joe Biden and KAMALA HARRIS won by over 80,000.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise this evening with a heavy heart. The violence that occurred today at the U.S. Capitol was senseless, destructive, and counter to our American values.

This past Sunday, each Member of this body took an oath to uphold the United States Constitution. And while the path of least resistance, particularly following today's events, would be to remain silent, my oath to uphold the Constitution does not permit me to maintain silence.

While systemic voter fraud was not something proven, we witnessed a systemic failure in the application of Pennsylvania's voting law when it comes to the 2020 general election.

In late 2019, the Commonwealth revisited and modernized its election law with the bipartisan Act 77. Granted, in late 2019, the Commonwealth's legislature did not have the foresight to anticipate how COVID-19 would present challenges to voting. Despite that, it is not up to the Governor, the secretary of the Commonwealth, nor the State supreme court to unilaterally create law.

The election abuses to Pennsylvania Act 77 taken by the Pennsylvania executive branch and upheld by the Pennsylvania judicial branch were clearly unconstitutional and had an obvious, if not major, impact on the 2020 election, particularly when it comes to the citizens' faith in the electoral process.

Irregularities in Pennsylvania included: Uneven application of the law; ballot curing; ignoring signature validation requirements; using unsecured drop boxes; accepting ballots beyond the deadlines; and interfering with certified poll watcher access, among others.

These actions were taken by the Commonwealth's Governor and secretary of state where the Pennsylvania Supreme Court circumvented the au-

thority of the State legislature. Furthermore, the chief law officer of the Commonwealth sat idly while this process unfolded.

Now, I joined many of my colleagues in Pennsylvania requesting the legislators in Harrisburg conduct an investigation and audit to ensure such negligence will be prevented in future elections.

I have serious concerns about how these irregularities in the application of the Commonwealth's election laws will play in future elections. Only with equal application of law will the voters of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania have certainty in their election processes.

Now, I remain committed to ensuring the voters receive an electoral system they deserve and where equal application of law is guaranteed. If our election integrity is compromised, we have failed the very voters who have sent us here to defend the Constitution.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS).

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The oath I took is very simple. Madam Speaker, you administered it. It is to support and defend the Constitution.

Now, as you walk back to the office buildings, you will walk by that wall that has when the various States accepted that Constitution. Remember, when a State accepts the Constitution, it agrees to accept every part of the Constitution. It doesn't get to pick and choose.

Pennsylvania was there when it was written. They were so enthusiastic about the Constitution, they approved it in 1787.

My State, Maryland, is a little further down the wall, 1788. They were there when it was written.

The clause that gave the legislature the power over the elections was there when they accepted it. It has been there since. How dare the judicial branch or the executive branch of that State usurp the legislative authority. That is a clear violation of the Constitution.

Now, we heard there is no evidence. Evidence?

The Pennsylvania Supreme Court unilaterally extended the deadline to receive absentee and mail-in ballots.

Does anybody contest that over here? Does it say the legislature did that?

No, it doesn't. It says the court did it.

That is a violation. That is what the Texas lawsuit was all about. We disadvantage other States when States like Pennsylvania, the executive branch and judicial branch, cheat on the Constitution; and that is what they did here.

But there is more evidence. But wait, there is more. The Democrat secretary of the Commonwealth eroded integrity by dismissing signature authentication on a ballot.

Does anyone here believe the Pennsylvania legislature would have agreed

to create a separate system for mail-in ballots and in-person ballots? That if you mail it in, you don't need a signature? But if you vote in person, you do and it has to be authenticated?

Of course not. The legislature clearly wouldn't have agreed to that. But that didn't stop the usurpation of constitutional authority.

Madam Chair, I vigorously support this objection, and I include in the RECORD the objection to counting the electoral votes for the State of Arizona additional signers.

OBJECTION TO COUNTING THE ELECTORAL  
VOTES FOR THE STATE OF ARIZONA

ADDITIONAL SIGNERS

Jeff Duncan SC-3  
Matt Gaetz FL-1

□ 0050

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, tonight, we will not be picking the President, for the people did that on November 3. Rather, tonight, in this House, we will decide whether American democracy survives. Let us be under no illusion. These are the stakes. If this objection succeeds and the will of 7 million Pennsylvania voters is cast aside, it will be the end of our representative democracy.

Now, there is no reasonable debate about what happened in this election in Pennsylvania. Seven million Pennsylvanians voted. Joe Biden won by over 81,000 votes. This was certified in 67 counties by bipartisan local-elected officials, including Republicans. And every single court, whether the judge is a Democrat or a Republican, has reaffirmed this outcome.

The objectors, however, claim we do not know the will of the people because the election in Pennsylvania was somehow conducted corruptly. Much of their objection centers around the State law passed in 2019 known as Act 77 that gives voters the option of expanded mail-in voting. Objectors are alleging that this law was somehow a brilliant plot by Democrats to disadvantage Republicans and rig elections. This is laughable.

Here are the facts. Act 77 was a Republican-led effort in a Republican-controlled legislature. Literally, every single Republican in the Pennsylvania Senate voted for it. And in the statehouse, the vote among Republicans was 105-2.

Here is what the Republican speaker of the Pennsylvania House had to say about Act 77: This bill does not benefit one party or the other or any one candidate or single election. It serves to preserve the integrity of every election and lift the voice of every voter in the Commonwealth.

So there is no question as to the facts surrounding this election. They

are as clear as they are overwhelming. The only question that remains is this: Will this House reaffirm our fidelity to our democracy, or will we end it?

I must concede, Madam Speaker, I have been naive about one subject. I always just assumed our democracy would naturally endure, almost as if it was predestined, I never even questioned it until the last several years.

Two centuries ago, one of our Founding Fathers cautioned against this notion. John Adams wrote, "Remember, democracy never lasts long. It soon wastes, exhausts, and murders itself. There was never a democracy yet that did not commit suicide."

I now realize the wisdom of his words. Never again will I take for granted our democracy. It must be jealously defended by every generation. Always.

But, Madam Speaker, despite the alarm, I feel that our democracy has been brought to this breaking point, as we have seen today. Nonetheless, I still maintain hope.

Growing up in Philadelphia, raised in an immigrant family, I was often brought down to visit the historic sights. Every summer, without fail, we would spend a day seeing Independence Hall, Congress Hall, the Liberty Bell.

It was at Independence Hall where our Nation was declared free and our Constitution born. At the Constitutional Convention, the oldest and most widely accomplished delegate was Benjamin Franklin, one of our greatest Founding Fathers and my city's greatest citizen.

On the final day, as the last delegates were signing the Constitution, Franklin pointed to the painted Sun on the back of the Convention chair. Observing the painters had found it difficult to distinguish a rising Sun from a setting Sun, Franklin went on to say:

I have often, during the course of this session, looked at that Sun without being able to tell whether it was rising or setting. But now, at length, I have the happiness to know it is a rising Sun.

Madam Speaker, on a day like today, when a mob has stormed the Capitol, and some Members are threatening the core of our democracy, it can be hard to tell whether for American democracy the Sun is rising or setting. But I maintain my faith that tonight, by an overwhelming bipartisan majority in Congress, we will uphold the will of "We the People," and our democracy will live.

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. I would like to point out that all the cases that have been thrown out have been thrown out on standing, not the evidence of voter fraud. I would also like to point out the same people who, for 4 years, have failed to find a shred of evidence to convict President Trump of

Russian collusion are the same people trying to discredit hardworking American poll watchers who are risking perjury by signing affidavits confirming massive voter fraud in multiple States.

The same fake news who took the word of Christine Blasey Ford against Justice Kavanaugh, who her own friends denied happened, also dismissed the sworn under penalty of perjury accounts from people who witnessed the election fraud.

The same fact-checkers who told you that Dominion machines weren't connected to the internet and couldn't be hacked are the same people telling you that there has been no voter fraud and no violations of election law. But it has been proven that these machines are connected and that they can be hacked.

We have heard repeatedly argued that objecting to these ballots is unconstitutional and violates the rights of State legislatures. They would rather us affirm fraud and pass the buck back to States rather than following the process Madison, Hamilton, Jefferson, and the Framers of the Constitution designed.

When States fail to do their job, we are the last line of defense. Congress is here for this exact situation. We are here to be the fail-safe when States refuse to protect the people's votes.

By objecting today, we are telling the thousands of witnesses who signed affidavits that we have their back, and we will not allow local officials who violate their own election laws to steal this election from those who lawfully voted.

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support the foundation of our democracy, the Constitution of the United States of America. This document is the fabric and the solid foundation of a nation we call America, which has been a beacon of hope and a shining city on the hill for over 230 years.

The words of our Constitution, as spelled out in Article II, Section 1, are very clear when it comes to our elections: mandating, not suggesting, not implying, but mandating that State legislatures, not secretaries of State, not State commissions, not county officials, not Governors, but State legislators prescribe the time, place, and manner of holding elections.

This mandate was not followed in the great State of Pennsylvania. If we allow this fraud to go on—in a football analogy, the moving of the goalpost after the ball has been kicked and in the air—the preview of coming attractions will be future elections that do not adhere to honest and open voting by "We the People" and the loss of our great Republic.

As a lady told me not long ago, don't spit in my face and tell me it is raining. This is exactly what has happened to the American people in this election. In the words of Winston Churchill, when Great Britain was under siege by Germany, he said: There will be a



time when doing your best is not good enough. We must do what is required.

And we must do what is required to save this great Republic.

Ms. WILD. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WILD. Madam Speaker, as terrifying as today was here in the people's House, it was, thankfully, fairly short in duration. In contrast, the pain and fear that so many Americans are experiencing this year has been long and continuous to this very moment.

Rather than pitting Americans against Americans, as we are here, we should be working to ensure rapid distribution of vaccines and adequate relief to Americans who are struggling economically because of this horrific pandemic. But we are not doing that. Instead, we have witnessed a stunning assault on our democracy itself.

This challenge is not an act of patriotism. The position of the objectors is completely incompatible with patriotism.

Our country is defined by her great people, and our democracy is defined above all else by our Constitution, a Constitution that these individuals want to ignore because they have decided that their judgment, the judgment of a small minority of partisan elites, should somehow override that of the more than 155 million Americans who participated in this election. That, my friends, is not democracy.

□ 0100

We should all remember this country's founding was a rejection of monarchy, a rejection of the notion that any one person could be all-powerful. Our commitment to self-determination is what gave rise to our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution. It is why our Founders made the choice to build a country anchored in respect for the rule of law rather than one tied to the whims of men. It is why we have free and fair elections that allow us to vote out those who hold office.

I am proud to join the vast majority of my colleagues in both Chambers, Republicans and Democrats alike, in making it clear that our democracy is bigger than any of us.

Let's be clear: Joe Biden and KAMALA HARRIS won a victory of 306 electoral votes in the electoral college, the same margin that President Trump won by in 2016 when he called it a landslide.

Nearly 7 million of my fellow Pennsylvanians braved this devastating pandemic and economic crisis to cast their ballots, culminating in a total turnout of more than 70 percent, the highest in the history of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. And nationwide, we saw record-breaking turnout.

Both in Pennsylvania and nationally, the President's efforts to overturn the election results in the courts failed resoundingly, with many of the strongest rebukes coming from judges the President himself appointed.

In fact, contrary to the assertion of my colleague from Georgia across the aisle, not a single lawsuit in Pennsylvania alleged fraud. The gentlewoman may not be aware of this, but allegations of fraud require specificity and detail, and no lawyer could risk his or her license to make such false claims.

I am heartened that several of the country's leading Republicans, including Senate Republican Majority Leader McCONNELL, Senator MITT ROMNEY, and former Republican Speaker of the House Paul Ryan, have spoken out against this political stunt.

Senator ROMNEY said: "The egregious ploy to reject electors may enhance the political ambition of some, but dangerously threatens our democratic Republic."

And as former Republican Representative Charlie Dent from my district said, the claim by the President of voter fraud in our State "was simply reprehensible; the truth is that he suppressed his own vote by discouraging mail-in voting."

And as Pennsylvania State Senator Gene Yaw, also a Republican, has said: "My question is, if the mail-in voting of Act 77 was so bad, why did The Trump Organization send out a mail-in ballot application to every registered Republican in the State?"

Today, I am thinking of all of the people who took the time to do their civic duty and vote, many standing in long lines or painstakingly researching how to vote by mail correctly.

We reject these disgraceful attacks on the voters of Pennsylvania and this attempt to throw out their votes.

To those in this Chamber who may cynically believe that stoking the forces of disinformation and division may be worth a short-term benefit to their political careers, I would urge serious self-reflection.

Our democracy is one of the most precious resources of the American people, protected against enormous odds and at great sacrifice by each generation of servicemembers and everyday citizens who put their lives on the line to build a freer and more equitable nation. They deserve better than what is happening in this Chamber today.

Mr. SMUCKER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMUCKER. Madam Speaker, I would like to start by making two basic points:

Number one, individual States who administer elections must ensure that they are conducted fairly, uniformly, and in accordance with the law; and

Number two, every American wants to be, and deserves to be, confident that our elections are secure and that all eligible legal votes are counted accurately and in a transparent manner.

And I will say this. In my district in Lancaster and York Counties, I think that occurred. I am very proud of my county election officials, who upheld

the Pennsylvania Constitution and followed the letter of the law; but, unfortunately, that sentiment is not shared across the Commonwealth.

Today, my objection is not about voter fraud; it is grounded on unconstitutional measures taken by bureaucrats and partisan justices in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania that have unlawfully changed how this election was carried out. This potentially changed the outcome and certainly caused millions of our States' voters to question the election results. Other speakers have outlined this issue.

In brief, the Pennsylvania State Legislature, in 2019, passed a bipartisan election law reform bill, and then the partisan Pennsylvania Supreme Court took it upon themselves to rewrite that law just 7 weeks before the election. They unlawfully legislated from the bench and made substantive changes to the law, including allowing for unsecured drop boxes and ordering that ballots received after the election be counted, among other things.

The Pennsylvania Secretary of State took it even further. Her unilateral, unconstitutional changes resulted in counties treating ballots differently so that some voters had the opportunity to change mail-in ballots to correct deficiencies, while in other counties, their ballots simply were not counted.

As Members of Congress, we serve as a voice for our constituents. This is the one time I have a voice in this process, and I cannot simply look away when tens of thousands of my constituents have real and legitimate concerns about how this election was conducted in Pennsylvania.

In fact, I think an inadequate response to those concerns by Pennsylvania officials is one of the major problems. Simple measures like audits should be routine and random and supported by both parties, and I believe they are critical for restoring faith in Pennsylvania's elections moving forward.

The bottom line for my constituents is that Pennsylvania's officials, at all levels, failed to conduct a uniform and legal election, and for that reason, they inappropriately and unlawfully certified the State's electors.

Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER), my colleague.

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER) for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the violence that occurred in the Capitol today was shameful, unacceptable, and un-American. We are a nation of laws, not lawlessness, and we will never give in to the mob.

Thank you to the men and women of our Capitol Police and other law enforcement agencies who heroically defended this building.

The criminal behavior we witnessed today does not erase the facts before us.

I am objecting to the certification of Pennsylvania's electoral votes because Governor Tom Wolf, Secretary of State Kathy Boockvar, and the Pennsylvania Supreme Court violated the State legislature's clear constitutional authority to set election proceedings.

Under the Pennsylvania Constitution, only the General Assembly has the power to set election law.

Additionally, Article II of the U.S. Constitution explicitly grants State legislatures, not the Governor acting alone and not the courts, the explicit power to determine the manner of appointing Presidential electors.

Pennsylvania's court unlawfully extended the deadline to receive absentee and mail-in ballots. Governor Wolf's administration dismissed signature authentication procedures for absentee and mail-in ballots, allowed for the uneven administration of the election across counties, and unilaterally changed Pennsylvania's election code without the State legislature's consent.

The Constitution is clear and the facts are indisputable.

This past weekend, each Member of this body stood in this Chamber and swore an oath to protect and defend our Constitution. I intend to fulfill my constitutional oath which the people of Pennsylvania have entrusted in me. My objection is grounded in the Constitution and rule of law.

If we allow the Governor to violate the constitutional rights of the General Assembly, what is stopping him from violating the constitutional rights of the 12.8 million Pennsylvanians our State legislators were elected to represent?

Mr. EVANS. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EVANS. Madam Speaker, I represent the Third District of Pennsylvania, which includes part of Philadelphia, the birthplace of America. It was in Philadelphia that the Constitution of the United States was written and signed, the very Constitution that we are all sworn to uphold as Members of the House of Representatives.

We are elected to serve our constituents, and it is our job to represent them and their interests in Congress.

Yesterday, I spoke to the son of the late Dick Thornburgh, who is a two-time Republican Governor of Pennsylvania and was Attorney General under President Ronald Reagan and President Bush. His son stressed to me that his father would have wanted the rule of law to prevail regardless of the political outcome, because he cared more about the safeguarding of democracy than partisanship.

In addition, Al Schmidt, who was a Republican commissioner of elections, said, when Philadelphia certified its results on November 23: "I'm proud that the birthplace of our Republic held the most transparent and secure election in the history of Philadelphia."

Instead of using this time to dispute the results of our fair and lawful election, we should be spending this time making sure vaccines are quickly given to essential workers and our most vulnerable communities, that people are getting housing.

We should look at rental assistance. We should ensure that that is available.

Small businesses, the engines of our economy, should be getting needed grants and loans.

That should be our focus.

Hospitals desperately need support and help. We should be paying attention to the needs of hospitals.

We are in the middle of a pandemic where hundreds of thousands of people are dying, and we are in a recession that is putting millions of Americans at risk of hunger, homelessness, or both. It is time we start legislating for the people.

One last person I want to mention is our junior Senator, Senator TOOMEY. There are very few things that he and I agree on, but he has stated very clearly that Joe Biden has won this election. He has stood up on the Senate floor and he has stated that.

So it needs to be very clear that the late Governor Thornburgh; Albert Schmidt, the commissioner; and our current junior Senator all have one thing in common: democracy first, partisanship second. Let's keep that in mind.

Ms. HERRELL. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico for 5 minutes.

Ms. HERRELL. Madam Speaker, this is not how I imagined my first speech in the House of Representatives or my first week to be in Washington.

The violence that occurred in this building yesterday is reprehensible and inexcusable. I am appalled by anyone who assaults our Nation's law enforcement officers.

I swore an oath on Sunday to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. We are here today delayed, but not deterred, to debate a constitutional question and follow a constitutional process.

The Constitution gives State legislators, not State executives or judges, the sole authority to determine how their State selects Presidential electors.

Nobody disputes that in Pennsylvania, as well as in other States, rules and regulations were changed by executive fiat or judicial edict.

These changes were significant and irregular. They included changes to vote-by-mail deadlines, identity verification requirements, and other ballot handling practices.

In Pennsylvania specifically, the Democrat Secretary of the Commonwealth and the Democrat-controlled Pennsylvania Supreme Court usurped the constitutional authority of the State legislature.

□ 0110

Together, they exceeded their authority by extending the deadline for absentee ballots and by waiving signature requirements for those ballots.

In their haste to make these changes, the secretary and the court created two different and unequal standards for voters. Pennsylvanians who chose to vote in person still had to have their signatures verified at their polling place, but those who chose to vote by mail did not. How is this process fair?

This objection is about Pennsylvania, but it affects every State. As a State Representative of New Mexico, Pennsylvania's unconstitutional actions disenfranchised my constituents and the constituents of my colleagues. It is my duty to give my constituents a voice. Signing these objections raises their concerns to the fullest extent my office allows.

I, again, condemn in the strongest terms the violence that took place here yesterday. We have many issues to solve, including reforms to restore all Americans' faith in the fairness of our elections. I look forward to those serious civil and peaceful debates.

Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, this process we are going through today isn't about personalities. This isn't about Joe Biden or Donald Trump. As hard as some try to paint it that way, let me say that names and personalities don't matter. This is, gravely, about the Constitution of the United States.

Almost 20 years ago, after the attacks on 9/11, Americans were persuaded to give up some of their constitutional liberties. Using the justification of that global crisis, the terrorist attacks on that fateful day, America saw the erosion of their liberties for the safety and security many felt they may receive through the USA PATRIOT Act and other resulting processes too many felt would keep us safe from another attack here on our shore.

This year, using the justification of the global pandemic, COVID-19, we once again saw our Nation's Constitution violated. You see, the Constitution is clear in Article II, Madam Speaker, that the power and duty to set the manner of national elections rests solely with the State legislatures.

That power doesn't rest with us. That power didn't rest in the hands of unelected county election officials, secretaries of state, or a supreme court but, rather, in the hands of the State legislatures, which pass laws setting the manner of elections held in their States.

This year, using the extraordinary circumstance of the COVID-19 pandemic, we witnessed these duly passed laws circumvented and usurped time and again, not by having the laws changed in the respective State legislative bodies, but those laws arbitrarily



and unilaterally changed by county clerks; secretaries of state; and, in this case of Pennsylvania, an elected supreme court, which is supposed to interpret the law, not make law.

When those nonlegislative entities change the laws without getting the general assemblies to change the law, in my opinion, the resulting ballots cast, either by mail or in person, those ballots were illegal under the law.

Illegal ballots should not be counted. Therefore, the resulting electoral votes should be considered invalid.

What bothers me is that so many of you are okay with that, that so many Americans, because their person won, you are okay with the manner in which that victory was gained.

It is politics. Look, I get it. But we didn't swear an oath to play politics. We swore an oath to the United States Constitution. As George Washington said: The Constitution is the guide which I will never abandon.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Madam Speaker, first, I do want to acknowledge the devastating events of the last 12 hours and to express my deep appreciation for those who have worked to secure this building and safeguard our democracy. On behalf of my colleagues, we are all grateful for your service.

I ran for this office on a platform of civility and decency, and many of my colleagues and constituents know that I am a third-generation veteran, and I grew up in a military household.

□ 0120

Madam Speaker, what you may not know, though, is that I grew up in a divided household. Throughout my childhood, one parent voted Democrat and the other Republican. In my purple household, I learned that duty to country was far more important than party allegiance. With each election, my father would say: "And when the election is done, we salute smartly and we carry on."

Now I live in and I serve in a community that has a lot in common with the home that I grew up in. It, too, is a purple place that honors civility and decency. Pennsylvania's Sixth District is, in many ways, a microcosm of the Commonwealth and of our Nation. Our voter registration in Chester County is 40-40-20, R, D, and I. Voters across my district commonly split their ticket, some voting for President-elect Biden while also voting down the ballot for Republicans for our State legislature.

What some of my colleagues are arguing today is that those very ballots are illegitimate. My colleagues cannot honestly believe that. In fact, just this week they joined me on the House floor to be sworn in to this hallowed body, and they trusted that the votes cast in their favor were legitimate. And they are right. If those votes counted, then

so too must the votes for President-elect Biden.

We have also heard today concerns about mail-in ballots. I am not a lawyer, but I am an engineer and, therefore, a student of numbers. It wasn't just Democrats who voted by mail. It was not a free-for-all, as it was described earlier. Madam Speaker, 600,000 Republicans in Pennsylvania across the State voted by mail. By questioning the election results, you are telling those Pennsylvanians that the hours they spent in line to cast their ballot or the trip they took to the post office in the middle of a pandemic just didn't matter.

Alan Novak is a man who served as the chair of the Republican Party in Pennsylvania for nearly a decade. I will say that again. The Chair of the Republican Party of Pennsylvania for a decade is one of those voters I am talking about in Pennsylvania. He lives in my district, and he split his ticket. He voted for me as his Member of Congress and also for President Trump. And he eloquently said:

What makes America great, exceptional, and enduring is our commitment to our government of laws, our orderly constitutional process that settles our election disputes, and our peaceful transfer of power with respect and civility. It is easy when it is pretty and the outcome is not controversial. But when it is not pretty and there is controversy, then it is even more important that we respect, honor, and abide by our revered and tested process for the orderly transfer of power. Perhaps that may be all that we can agree on, and it is the need for grace, respect, and civility.

So I ask my colleagues across the aisle: Are you willing to disenfranchise people like Mr. Novak and the more than 400,000 people in Pennsylvania's Sixth District?

Perhaps some of the independent and pragmatic spirit that is so prevalent among voters in my community comes from the history of the place that we call home. Many Americans have visited Philadelphia and our historic sites, but very few make it out to my community, which is the home of Valley Forge. Here, General George Washington led the Continental Army to winter quarters. The war had not been going well for our young soldiers, and that winter was harder still. It was bitterly cold, and food shortages and smallpox were abundant. Many people died.

We remember what happened there because it was a test of our endurance, a demonstration of devotion to mission and to our country over ourselves. Coming out of that awful winter experience, our troops emerged better trained, united, and ultimately victorious. In those harsh, dark times, they found their common ground and their fortitude.

Just like then, it is in these trying moments when we learn who our leaders truly are. They are the ones who don't just represent the people or give orders or ready us for a fight. They are those who educate and who speak

truth. They inspire confidence and unity rather than sowing division and strife. There is a striking parallel between our nascent country and what they endured in Valley Forge and what we are enduring right now: A hard winter of division, illness running rampant, and an uncertain future.

Today, our country's resolve is being tested, and I know that we will pass this test together and be made stronger. We now have the opportunity and the responsibility to do that tonight by upholding the will of the people, by voting to certify the results of this electoral college and by moving forward with a servant heart and a common resolve to preserve this great experiment that is the United States of America.

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BABIN. It is with great pride and a profound sense of responsibility that I object to the 2020 election in the State of Pennsylvania.

I am very proud to stand alongside fellow patriots who have pushed back against a fraudulent and criminal election process—a process that was the antithesis to the very rule of law that governs these United States.

At the same time, standing here tonight is surreal because this is a critical juncture that will undoubtedly determine the survivability of this great Republic.

Our free and fair election process—and by extension, the people's trust in its legitimacy—is what has separated us as a nation. A process that we have shared with the world, its moral force. A process that now, sadly, has been bastardized by those more interested in the maintenance of power than they are in the free and open voice of the American people.

If I remember correctly, Democrats were calling for transparency in 2000 and 2004, when George W. Bush was elected; and again in 2016, when President Trump took office.

Where are you now?

I ask this, Madam Speaker: What do you have to lose by having a thorough investigation to determine the validity of these votes?

Why not encourage an investigation to relieve the concerns of half of the people in this country?

If you are so convinced that Biden was elected legitimately, what do you have to fear?

If there was no fraud, simply show us the proof. Investigate it. Validate it. This isn't about one candidate versus another. This is about upholding the principles that are indispensable to the existence of the democratic Republic that we are so fortunate to call home.

I have no doubt that there was widespread election fraud this past November, and I am not alone. I stand here today speaking for 75 million Americans whose voice was unconstitutionally silenced.

To you, the silenced, I say this: I will continue to fight for you. You have been heard. For more than 240 years, tyranny has sought to extinguish the light of freedom.

As Ronald Reagan said before: Freedom is a fragile thing, and it is never more than one generation away from extinction.

The Constitution and the Bible on which it stands is stronger than the cheap tyrannical tactics of those who seek to destroy it.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD).

Mr. BUDD. Madam Speaker, mob violence is not representative of our country or of this building. The American people—at least the ones who are still up watching right now—have seen this body return to a peaceful debate. And that is the American way. So let's get back to that debate and let's talk for a moment about Pennsylvania.

For decades, absentee voting was reserved for members of the military and citizens who are medically or physically unable to get to the polls. But in 2019, Pennsylvania dramatically increased the amount of ballots that would be cast in the Presidential election through expanded, no-excuse, mail-in voting.

On September 17, Pennsylvania's Democrat-controlled Supreme Court violated the Constitution by extending the deadline to receive mail-in ballots. Article II states that legislatures, not the courts, determine the time, manner, and place of their States' elections. But Pennsylvania's high court directed the State officials to assume that non-postmarked ballots were received on time without any evidence that they were sent before election day.

On October 23, while early voting was already underway, the State supreme court ruled that election officials did not have to authenticate signatures for mail-in ballots.

To sum it up, Pennsylvania officials illegally did three critical things:

One, they radically expanded vote by mail for virtually any reason.

Two, they removed restrictions when a ballot can be sent in.

Three, they removed signature verification on those very ballots.

Just this week, the Pennsylvania Senate pleaded with Members of this body to delay certification until the Supreme Court resolves these disputes. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania violated their own constitution. They violated the U.S. Constitution. They opened the door for thousands of unverifiable ballots.

Because they failed to guarantee the integrity of their votes, I cannot consent to accepting Pennsylvania's electoral votes.

□ 0130

Ms. DEAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the challenge.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DEAN. Madam Speaker, this is a sad day for America—a day of shame, a day of ignominy, an attack on this Capitol, an attack on our country.

Madam Speaker, our words matter. Mobs, thugs, insurrectionists, domestic terrorists attacked our government with the aim of attacking our free and fair elections.

Make no mistake, these terrorists came armed, armed with false flags; armed with hate; armed with weapons; and, tragically, armed with lies forced to them by those at the highest level of government, including some from the legislative and, yes, the executive branches. Incited by the one at the highest level of government, they attacked people, property, this Capitol, this cathedral of democracy.

Words matter. In his last words to our Nation and to all of us here, our dear colleague, John Lewis, wrote last July: "Democracy is not a state. It is an act." And each generation has an obligation to preserve its institutions.

Democracy is a series of acts, acts by you and by me, by citizens, one building upon the other and another—not acts that we have heard and seen and suffered today, words and acts to incite violence, acts that tear at the very fabric of our democracy.

Madam Speaker, yet, I have hope. We, too, are armed. We are armed with the facts. We are armed with the truth. We are armed with the love of our country. We are armed with our sworn oaths. And we are armed with our precious Constitution.

We have faced tyranny and insurrection before. We are here tonight to herald to America and to the world: We will defend our democracy, and we will endure.

Madam Speaker, when I came into work this morning, as I was preparing to come to the floor, I read Tom Friedman's op-ed, which began with the words from the Gospel of Mark: For what shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world but lose his soul?

For what shall it profit any man.

Madam Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues to have the courage to uphold their oath, courage like that of Congresswoman Margaret Chase Smith, a lifelong Republican and the first in her party to speak out against McCarthyism. Putting duty over fear, she said: "I do not want to see the Republican Party ride to political victory on the Four Horsemen of Calumny—Fear, Ignorance, Bigotry, and Smear. Surely, we Republicans are not that desperate for victory."

Madam Speaker, for today, we have seen the cost of victory by such means. It shook the very walls of this building. Our colleagues know there is no truth to this challenge.

For what shall it profit a man.

Madam Speaker, it has been my solemn honor to participate in this sad day. I pray for our country.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the objection of the electoral certification of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, as a new Representative here, I did not envision my first speech on the House floor to be this, here tonight, but rather, a tribute to our first responders and frontline workers who have been a shining light in an otherwise tough year for us all.

After the events tonight, I am especially grateful for our men and women who put service above self, confronting lawlessness and danger while protecting this very Chamber, its Members, and our constitutional Republic.

As a Member of the people's House, and the wife of a first responder, thank you to our law enforcement here today. But, especially, after tonight's unacceptable breach of the people's House, I am furthermore resolved in the fact that we, as representatives of the people, must take a stand for every American's right to a free and fair election as guaranteed by the Constitution.

Article I, Section 4, Clause 1 of the Constitution explicitly rests the time and manner of our elections in the hands of our State legislatures. However, State law in the 2020 election was modified or circumvented without approval of the State legislature. These actions are in clear violation of the Constitution, specifically Article II, Section 1, Clause 2, which grants State legislatures the sole authority to establish how State Presidential electors are appointed.

These changes, along with other election irregularities throughout the 2020 election, require me, as a Member of this body, to object to the certification of these electoral votes, just as my colleagues across the aisle have objected to every Republican Presidential election over the last 20 years.

Tonight, as we undertake the very serious responsibility of debating these State electoral certifications, I urge my colleagues to listen earnestly and with an open mind, remembering that just 3 days ago, we swore an oath to the United States Constitution, not a political party.

Our constituents are counting on us. Our country is counting on us. Our children are counting on us, and we cannot let them down.

Madam Speaker, in December, 25 of my freshman colleagues and I sent you a letter imploring you to investigate these election irregularities. To date, we have not received a response. That brings us to today.

My colleagues across the aisle have repeatedly invoked our Founding Father, Benjamin Franklin, who famously said: We have a republic, if we can keep it.

I say, let's keep it.

Madam Speaker, it is with that sentiment in mind that I ask my colleagues to defend the power vested in this legislative branch by the U.S. Constitution and reject the certification of the electoral votes of the State in question. It is our responsibility to have



courage in the face of adversity and bring integrity back to this process.

Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from the great State of Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the great State of Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK), my friend.

Madam Speaker, as Americans, we believe governments receive their just powers from the consent of the governed. That sacred transaction can only happen legitimately in a free and fair election.

Election integrity is the very lifeblood of our unrivaled system of self-government. The law and the Constitution gave Congress not only the authority but, I believe, the responsibility to serve as the last check on the integrity of our Presidential elections. We either believe, according to statute, that every elector was "lawfully certified" and "regularly given," or we don't.

States certainly have broad delegated powers to administer Federal elections, but they still must operate within the bounds of the Constitution.

Despite receiving numerous petitions—to the detriment of the country, I might add—the Supreme Court failed to answer the most important question of the 2020 election: Can entities outside of the State legislatures make election law?

The plain language of Article II of the Constitution answers the question unequivocally no.

The decisions made today in these Chambers are of the utmost consequence, and the horrible precedent that will be established if we don't act will have lasting impact on our beloved Republic.

Madam Speaker, this proceeding is not just about the integrity of this election. It is about ensuring the integrity of all future elections.

I take no pleasure or pride in making my objection today, nor do I wish for any State electors to be disqualified. However, based on the law, the Constitution, and my conscience, I cannot support certifying votes from any State that violated the Constitution.

Madam Speaker, this decision is not about loyalty to a President. It is about my fidelity to the Constitution and the oath that I swore.

Mr. LAMB. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMB. Madam Speaker, I came here tonight prepared to talk about the place I represent and how well the Democratic and Republican county officials ran our election. I wanted to point out that in my home county of Allegheny County, in the place they were counting the votes, there were 31 video cameras—31—in the same place, just showing people counting votes, every single one of them on paper, with representatives from both campaigns watching.

Madam Speaker, I wanted to point out to all these great lovers and supporters of the Pennsylvania legislature that it was the Republican Pennsylvania legislature that passed a Republican bill that they all voted for and supported that set up the system under which we just ran the election, and that the reason the President lost was because he was not as popular as other Republicans in our State. He got fewer votes than all of them.

Madam Speaker, I wanted to lay out all this evidence because I thought it was a sign of respect for my colleagues and for all the Americans out there who don't know who to trust. I was raised on that. I was raised on that respect, which makes this a hard speech for me to give. Because to do this with any kind of honesty means admitting and declaring in this House that these objections don't deserve an ounce of respect—not an ounce.

□ 0140

A woman died out there tonight, and you are making these objections.

Let's be clear about what happened in this Chamber today. Invaders came in for the first time since the War of 1812. They desecrated these Halls and this Chamber and practically every inch of ground where we work. For the most part, they walked in here free. A lot of them walked out free. There wasn't a person watching at home who didn't know why that was—because of the way that they look.

My point, Madam Speaker, is this: Enough has been done here already to try to strip this Congress of its dignity, and these objectors don't need to do anymore.

We know that that attack today didn't materialize out of nowhere. It was inspired by lies, the same lies that you are hearing in this room tonight. And the Members who are repeating those lies should be ashamed of themselves. Their constituents should be ashamed of them.

We know what is going to happen as soon as I walk away, what has happened all night tonight, what will continue to happen. They will take these same symbols, these same concepts, smuggle them into their arguments, and make the same arguments. I want people at home, anyone who is still watching, to know that these arguments are not for them; they are for you.

None of the evidence we wanted to discuss here tonight will change their opinions or what they are about to say. But you need to know that is not the end. It is not as if there is nothing we can do because of that. And if there was, I don't think this Nation would have made it to almost 250 years.

The fact is, Madam Speaker, that at the end of the day, people—

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Yes, ma'am. The point of order would be that the gentleman said that there were lies on this floor here today, looking over in this direction. I ask that those words be taken down.

We may have a disagreement on matters, but—

The SPEAKER.

The gentleman's demand is not timely.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania will proceed.

Mr. LAMB. Madam Speaker, the fact is, at the end of the day, it hurts. It hurts them; it hurts this country. It hurts all of us. But the fact is that the people have made this country work by not giving in.

Go ahead. Shout it out.

One last thing to say, Madam Speaker. And I thank you for your patience. All people need to know tonight, Madam Speaker—

Madam Speaker, the truth hurts. But the fact is this: We want this government to work more than they want it to fail.

After everything that has happened today, we want that more than ever. Know that. Know that, the people watching at home. We want this government to work. We will make it work. They will not make it fail.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PERRY. When is the appropriate time to ask that the words be stricken, be taken down?

The SPEAKER. Immediately after the words are uttered.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Louisiana seek recognition?

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, my, my, my. Let us take a deep breath, shall we?

Madam Speaker, the cornerstone of the strength of our American Republic is not only the peaceful transition of power; it is the peaceful transition of a lawful power. It is within the parameters of our oath, indeed, is our duty to inquire if we suspect that perhaps our elections have been compromised.

Much has been said about what we do not know. What we do not know calls for investigation.

What we do know is that, in the disputed States, Governors, secretaries of state, or local election commissions acted in violation of the Election Clause of the U.S. Constitution, wherein State legislatures are granted the sole authority to determine how Presidential electors are appointed. It is that simple. State executive officials usurped the constitutionally vested authority of State legislatures within several of the sovereign States.

Now, why we are involved in Congress? Because the Founders gave us a

narrow role. If we suspect that an election was compromised in a sovereign State, then we have a role in the seating of those electors and the counting.

America is not a confederacy of States. We are a union of States. We are a representative republic. Therefore, each sovereign State has a deep obligation to follow the writ of its own election law during a Federal election.

We would not be having this conversation if our objections were solely rested upon the elections of sovereign State Governors or State senators and representatives. It is a Federal election for the President and Vice President of the United States. We certainly have a role, and we should investigate and support that role.

Madam Speaker, America is an anointed nation, born of imperfect men driven by perfect intent. May we be worthy of what it is to be an American, what it is to be a representative of the American people.

May I ask, may we seek the quiet whisper of God's own voice within us. And I ask my colleagues to consider supporting this objection.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW).

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, before I start, something I didn't plan on saying. This is a debate. It is a discussion. Everybody has a right to an opinion. That is American. Because someone doesn't agree with your view or your ideas does not mean that they are liars. It means they have a different view, a different opinion.

And I think, for God's sake, as people watch this or see it or hear it, they expect more from us than that. We can disagree at a certain level. There is nothing worse than moral pomposity.

You know, today was an amazing and terrible day. But one thing that we do know is that our law enforcement protected lives, and they protected and preserved our democracy. I watched firsthand, as I always have, just as I do back home in south Jersey, these brave men and women put their lives on the line to defend all of us.

May God bless the woman who lost her life today, and may God bless what will always be the greatest Nation in the history of the world: the United States of America.

At the core of our country's greatness is our democratic system of government. Without faith in the integrity of our elections, Americans will not have faith in our democracy.

The United States of America is the international embodiment of freedom and opportunity, the shining city on a hill. Free and fair elections have always been a hallmark of America's greatness.

After this past Presidential election, approximately 60 million Americans have serious doubts about the outcome. That is a number that we cannot ignore.

□ 0150

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I started this day disheartened that our colleagues were going to drag us through this cynical political charade of objecting to duly certified electoral college votes, but I was ready and eager to defend Pennsylvania's elections and the will of Pennsylvania's voters.

Never did I expect to be answering calls from family and friends concerned for my safety or to have to barricade myself in an office. But most important of all, never did I expect to see our Capitol overrun by armed insurrectionists intent on disrupting our government at the urging of the President.

What happened here today has made me heart-sick for our country, but it only strengthens my resolve to uphold the rule of law and to protect the decision of Pennsylvania's voters.

Earlier this week, we raised our hands and swore an oath to bear true faith and allegiance to the Constitution of the United States. But, today, those who are blocking the counting of electors from Pennsylvania are showing that their allegiance lies not to the Constitution or to their constituents, and many would argue not even to the Republican Party, but to their own political fortunes and the outgoing President.

Pennsylvania's voters, not Members of Congress, are tasked with choosing Pennsylvania's Presidential electors, and particularly not congressmen from other States. The people have spoken, and Pennsylvania certified our electors. We must respect our oath here by rejecting this unfounded objection to Pennsylvania's electoral votes, and not substitute Congress' judgment for that of the people of Pennsylvania.

Legal challenges to elections are serious matters, and that is why there is a place to consider those challenges: In courtrooms before impartial judges.

And Pennsylvania's legal process has worked. The pseudo-legal arguments that are being raised by the objectors here today are not new. Over the past 2 months, the President and his allies have filed more than 20 lawsuits to challenge the Pennsylvania election. Those challenges have been rejected in Federal courts, State courts, appellate courts, and the United States Supreme Court. Challenges have been rejected by judges who are registered Democrats, Republicans, Independents, and who have been appointed by Democratic and Republican Presidents.

And why did they lose all those cases?

As Third Circuit Judge Bibas, a Trump appointee, wrote, "Free, fair elections are the lifeblood of our democracy. Charges of unfairness are serious. But calling an election unfair does not make it so. Charges require specific allegations and then proof. We have neither here."

What the Court said points to an important distinction about when and

how claims of election misconduct are made. It is easy to make wild claims of election fraud on cable television or Twitter, but those claims are not facts. And while there may be no immediate consequences for misleading the public with such statements, there is certainly a penalty for misleading the courts.

A lawyer faces fines, jail, and loss of his or her license for making frivolous or false claims. The lawyers for the Trump campaign never alleged widespread fraud or illegal voting had impacted Pennsylvania's elections because those claims are false.

When our colleagues indulge in this political theatre and endorse fringe conspiracy theories, they may think there are no consequences because they know that this time the majorities of the House and Senate will overrule them. But as the entire world saw today, their baseless claims of election fraud do have consequences. They undermine faith and respect for our elections and our government. They chip away at the foundation of our constitutional Republic and they take a sledgehammer to the peaceful transfer of power. It is our job to respect the rule of law and reject this political charade.

Finally, I want to offer my deepest respect to our Republican colleagues in both the House and the Senate who have withstood intense political pressure, and today honor their oath in the rule of law by rejecting these unfounded objections.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in favor of the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Speaker, I would first like to say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who said we should be ashamed over here, I am not ashamed, and neither are my colleagues over here. We are actually proud of what we are doing and what we are standing for. So I hope the RECORD will show that.

Yesterday's cowardly attack on our American democracy was a horrible act. While Congress attempted to execute their constitutional duty to debate and vote on this certification of the electoral college, violence interrupted the proceedings in an attempt to stop the democratic process.

Those who committed these acts are domestic terrorists and should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. And I thank the Capitol Police and all of the law enforcement organizations that pushed back against this mob.

I can't help but be reminded of the bravery during the baseball shooting on myself and my Republican colleagues in June of 2017. I thank God every day for their presence.

The American people deserve full transparency in the electoral process, with confidence that any irregularities and inconsistencies in that process will be fully investigated.

As a former Texas secretary of state, I know the electoral process well. And



above all, I know what the courts, the executive branch, and the elections officials can and cannot do without approval of the State legislature. During my tenure, I knew that my authority was confined to the powers the legislature provided me. If States fail to abide by the Constitution and follow their own laws, it calls into question whether the votes in Texas, or any other State, are fairly represented.

And now, as a duly elected Member of Congress, the Constitution outlines my rights to speak and voice my constituents' concerns with my vote. It is pivotal that we have free and fair elections in our representative democracy and, more importantly, that we trust in the results of those elections.

In no way is voicing an objection an attempt to overturn an election. And when this process is complete and all objections have been heard, I acknowledge that we will have a peaceful transfer of power on January 20.

Faith in our system must be restored and Americans must be confident that their vote matters, and only lawful votes will be counted. This is a sad day in our Nation's history, but a solemn reminder that our country will not falter and will not fail. In God we trust.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. CAWTHORN).

Mr. CAWTHORN. Madam Speaker, as I said in my convention speech, I want a new generation of Americans to be radicals—to be radicals for freedom and for liberty, but not radicals for violence. I am bitterly disappointed by the protest that happened yesterday. The actions of a violent few were cowardly and pathetic, and I am not afraid to call it out.

The Republican Party is a party of limited government. It is the big tent party. It is not the party of destruction.

Madam Speaker, the oath I took just days ago demand that I speak out in defense not of one President or another, but in defense of a hallowed document that has safeguarded this Republic for over 200 years. The Constitution grants power solely to State legislatures to determine how elections are carried out. When other officials who are not vested with constitutional authority usurp their role and grind the Constitution under their heel, I must object.

□ 0200

Our Nation is a nation of resilience. In Valley Forge, George Washington prayed for a republic to be formed from the ashes of a monarchy. At Gettysburg, Americans gave their lives to defend a very simple idea, that the American democracy that had been earned with the blood of their forefathers would not perish due to internal division.

Then, on the islands of Iwo Jima and Okinawa, American servicemen gave their lives to defend this Nation's freedom from fascism.

What unites each and every generation of Americans is the idea that those who submit themselves to the authority of government ought to have a voice in that same government.

We are Americans here in this Chamber and in this country. But what does it really mean to be an American? It means believing in the rule of law. It means speaking up in defense of our founding principles and in defense of the Constitution.

Being an American means that you are proud of your country but that you never beat your chest. And being an American means that sometimes you must stand alone while others sit.

Now, obviously, I can't stand, but trust me, if I could stand, I would stand in defense of our Constitution today.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, I completely agree with my colleague Representative DWIGHT EVANS, and I remind this Chamber that Pennsylvania is the cradle of American democracy.

We can't claim to be the birthplace of American democracy. That would be a disservice to James Otis, Jr., who, in 1761, stood up in a Massachusetts courtroom and argued against the King's writs of assistance.

But Pennsylvania is the cradle of democracy. It is where we hosted the signing of the Declaration of Independence and the American Constitution.

It was Pennsylvanians who immediately went to battle to defend this idea of democracy. They went right after Bunker Hill to the Siege of Boston. American riflemen were instrumental at the transformational Battles of Trenton and Saratoga in victory. And it is Independence Hall where these documents got signed, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

You heard my colleagues. You heard Representative HOULAHAN talking about the privations at Valley Forge, all in support of creating democracy.

You heard Representative BRENDAN F. BOYLE quoting John Adams, that democracy only dies by suicide.

You heard Representative DEAN quoting John Lewis, our hero, who said: Democracy is not a state. It is an act.

You heard Representative WILD talking about this stunning assault on our democracy.

If it seems like we get a little prickly in Pennsylvania about assaulting democracy, you are right. We do. Pennsylvania is the cradle of democracy.

You heard how foolish and empty these challenges are. Representative LAMB said it: 31 cameras filming the place where the count was happening, resulting in thousands of hours of videotape—you can see it on YouTube—proving there was no fraud.

You heard Representatives MICHAEL F. DOYLE and BRENDAN F. BOYLE talk-

ing about Act 77, how the Republicans in Pennsylvania were falling all over themselves to pass this law for mail-in voting because they thought it would help them.

You heard Representative SCANLON explaining why there were no allegations of fraud made in court because a lawyer going into court and lying to the court gets his or her ticket to practice law punched. They can be disbarred.

Politicians can say anything on cable TV, but they have to be darn careful when they are in court. So all these big TV talkers never alleged fraud in court.

Let me tell you about one court case. It was a case where they brought on their best legal talent. It was a case where they drew as a judge a staunch, principled, conservative Republican, Judge Matthew Brann. He called this case "strained legal arguments without merit" and "speculative accusations." He called it "like Frankenstein's monster," a "haphazardly stitched together" case.

Judge Brann said he "has no authority to take away the right to vote of even a single person, let alone millions of citizens."

On appeal Judge Bibas, a Trump appointee writing for the Third Circuit, agreed. He said: "Calling an election unfair does not make it so. Charges require specific allegations and then proof. We have neither here."

So, we have judges—dozens and dozens of them, Federal judges, State judges, Democrats, Republicans—turning away these challenges. All they ever wanted was evidence.

Here is the number-one rule when you go to court: Don't forget to bring the evidence with you.

This objection, in all seriousness, reflects the most profound disrespect to our American judiciary. We Pennsylvanians understand democracy. It was in Pennsylvania that our Founders signed the Constitution, and Article II makes it plain as day: We elect our President. We don't have a king.

If you can undo a Presidential election simply by alleging that something was amiss, then we don't have a democracy at all. We have something else entirely.

And if we vote to sustain this objection, we are not upholding our Constitution at all. We are doing something else entirely.

Let's vote "no" on this objection.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Madam Speaker, every one of us swore an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, both foreign and domestic. I swore that oath in uniform, and the first part of that oath is the same as what we swear here in Congress.

The last time we needed to defend our Constitution against a domestic



enemy, we fought a civil war. And at the conclusion of that Civil War we passed the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments that make clear that no State is so sovereign that they can deprive their citizens of equal protection of the laws.

When it comes to elections, that means one person gets one vote. It doesn't mean that other citizens can dilute the votes of other citizens and deprive them of equal protection. And it doesn't mean that a State can do that by law or by practice.

So whether the law was changed and made it such that there is no way to provide equal protection—one person, one vote—or the practice was corrupted, it cannot stand. Frankly, lastly, it must guarantee that there is a proof that it was equal protection under the law.

None of that happened in a number of States. The people of America, tens of millions of them who came out to vote, have been unheard by this body and by far too many courts. We need to show them the respect they are due by the Constitution of the United States of America, the Constitution that we fought to sustain to end the era of Jim Crow to pass civil rights legislation, the Voting Rights Act, the Civil Rights Act, and so many other pieces of jurisprudence.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman needs to maintain his position and control of the time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this objection and to give voice to the 249,386 men and women of Ohio's Sixth Congressional District who have had their voices silenced by the rogue political actors in Pennsylvania who unilaterally and unconstitutionally altered voting methods to benefit the Democratic candidate for President.

Secretaries of state and State supreme courts cannot simply ignore the rules governing elections set forth in the Constitution. They cannot choose to usurp their state legislatures to achieve a partisan end, Constitution be damned.

Madam Speaker, this is a sad day for America. We have seen too many sad days like this recently: assaults on courthouses, police stations, and now the U.S. Capitol. People who disagree with the results of police work and court decisions are wrong to respond violently. And people who disagree with the results of an election are also wrong to respond with violence. Thank you to the Capitol Police and all the law enforcement involved for protecting the people's House today.

Madam Speaker, some may question our motives for raising these objections, but other than the Bible, our Constitution is the most sacred document known to man because it created the most free and prosperous nation in human history.

□ 0210

2021 has the chance to be remembered for when the leaders of a deeply divided America came together to defend that sacred document and to ensure that the integrity of future Presidential elections is ensured. It is imperative we take this opportunity. The future of our Republic depends on it.

Benjamin Franklin, in the summer of 1787, during the heated debate to create our sacred Constitution, said these famous words: "I have lived long, sir, a long time . . . and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth . . . that God governs in the affairs of men."

"And, if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid? We have been assured, sir, in the sacred writing that 'Except the Lord build it, they labor in vain that build it.'"

Madam Speaker, I pray that we would turn to the God Almighty that ordained our Nation into being to help us in our time of need.

Mr. KINZINGER. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINZINGER. Madam Speaker, as a student of foreign policy, if somebody described to me the actions that we saw, I would have assumed we were in a failed nation or a banana republic. Storming past police, some carrying the flag of the Confederacy, the mob breached this House.

But there is good news: The democracy held today.

For the last few years, misinformation and fear has been fed into people for profit and power, and for too many years, leaders around the country said nothing and sometimes echoed those messages because of the belief that winning, no matter the cost, was worth everything.

Today, we saw the result of ignoring these warning signs.

People look to Washington to give hope. Instead, we simply amplify fears.

People look to us for expertise on what can and can't be possible. Sometimes it is easier to say what makes people feel good instead of the hard facts.

Today, some Members of Congress argue that we can unilaterally pick the next President, that with our glorious wisdom, armed with Twitter, we know better than the American people. Some have shown that, if conspiracies are repeated enough, they become facts and they aren't disputed.

Even here in this Chamber after the events today, some speeches have been shockingly tone-deaf. I have seen people applaud cheap political lines that are embarrassing.

Power and cultural fights have divided us so much that they are the ultimate goal now, and sometimes the oath we swear to uphold feels like a prop.

People have been lied to by too many for too long.

So here is the truth: Joe Biden won this election, the effort will fail, and everybody knows it.

For some out there, this isn't about making a statement for the betterment of our country; it is about avoiding the pain of leveling with the people and telling them the truth: the emperor has no clothes.

I know many are disappointed in the result, but what legacy are we leaving? Have our kids seen the day where Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill had a beer over their differences, or have they learned that to lead, you must tweet, and sometimes all in caps, because now this is Hollywood, fame is the ultimate goal?

But the first step that we can take to restore this is to reject the charade, and what happens next is up to us.

We get threatened with primaries; we worry about the political implications. But our names will long be forgotten; the legacy of now will exist.

The bottom line: If we ask men and women to be willing to give their lives for this Nation and we talk about their service with tears in our eyes, shouldn't we be willing to give up our jobs to uphold that Constitution?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER).

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Madam Speaker, is this a country, is this an America that we want to give to our children, a country of lawlessness, of might makes right, of mob rule?

Previous generations of Americans have laid down their lives to answer "no" to that question. I do not want to be the first generation of Americans so selfish as to answer "yes." Nothing is more important to me than preserving this constitutional Republic as a Representative.

Article II of the Constitution states: "Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors," meaning that it is the duty of the State legislatures to select their electors in a manner they stipulate. It is right here.

The Founders of our Republic did not want to federalize elections, which is why they reserved the selection of electors to the State legislatures.

Historically, when Congress intervened in the electoral process, it was in the Civil War. It was when States were sending multiple slates of electors. But that is not the case today.

Of the six States actively being contested, five have Republican legislatures; five are controlled by one party; five have the authority to get together and to vote to change the elector that they sent to us.

How many of the six did? Not one.

Pennsylvania did not get together and vote as a body and send us a new slate of electors. They did not send us a bill or a resolution citing injustice at the State level.

None of them.

Are they cowards? Do they not know the Constitution? Have they not read



it, like you and I? Or are they merely passing the buck?

Here is the reality. Look, I believe this was not a fraud-free election. I believe that there were problems in Pennsylvania and in Georgia. But the Constitution gives us the right to fix that at the State level, not throw out the electoral college. We do not want to absolve the responsibility of the people in those States to hold their own lawmakers accountable.

I, as a Washington State Congresswoman, don't know better than the people in Pennsylvania and Georgia.

Folks, we can't vote to undermine the electoral college today. We have to uphold it.

Mr. POSEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POSEY. Madam Speaker, as you have heard from both sides of the aisle over and over and over today and tonight, Members of Congress take an oath to protect and defend the Constitution.

Clearly, the Constitution says State legislatures make voting laws, period, end of subject. And, clearly, in Pennsylvania and some other States, non-legislators changed those voting laws.

No matter who wins or who loses, those are violations of the Constitution whether you, me, or anyone else likes it or not.

As Congressman DAVIDSON pointed out, over a dozen FBI agents were immediately dispatched to fully investigate Bubba Wallace's garage door. But, sadly, the FBI never responded to my request to investigate massive voting irregularity accusations, like the video footage from Georgia that we all wished we didn't see.

Neither has the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of State, the Postal Inspector General, the Director of National Intelligence, the CIA, and, saddest of all, the U.S. Department of Justice.

The right to vote is not only a constitutional right, it is also a civil right, and we must protect it. Running a fair and transparent election is not something America should run away from. It is something we must live up to.

Every eligible American has a right to have their vote counted and the right to feel confident that his or her vote was counted, not neutralized by an illegal vote.

□ 0220

Otherwise, I fear our Republic is doomed. That is why I implore you to support a full investigation.

Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the fine gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, this has been an interesting day. And I know we want to debate this, and we brought up all kinds of things, all kinds of points of history and what happened and where it happened and all the rest of this, and we

are very, very grateful to the Capitol Police and all those who came in to protect us.

But the real debate right now about Pennsylvania is Pennsylvania's Act 77. Was it constitutional or was it unconstitutional? All the rest of the trimmings you can set aside and just decide: Was it constitutional or unconstitutional?

Act 77 changed Pennsylvania's voting law and Pennsylvania's Constitution.

Now, Pennsylvania could change that law, but it is done through an amendment to the constitution. It is not just done because somebody would like to see that done.

We had a mail ballot that was available. It was an absentee ballot. We did not have a no-excuse ballot.

What did Pennsylvania have to do to get to the point where they would have a no-excuse mail-in ballot?

Number one, in two successive sessions of the Pennsylvania Legislature, that had to be passed in that legislation, one session after the other. If it passed both times, then it had to be published in every one of the 67 counties of Pennsylvania, twice. When that was finished, it then had to go before the Pennsylvania voters to decide whether they wanted the constitution amended.

Pennsylvania did the first one. They actually did take a vote, and it was overwhelming. But then they scrapped it, and they put it in an omnibus bill. That is an unconstitutional change. You cannot do it. It is that simple.

So I love the idea about Washington crossing the Delaware. I love the idea about Washington going through a terrible winter.

I hate the idea of what we had to go through today. But if oaths don't matter, and we have all taken them, and if the Constitution doesn't matter, why do we even do it? Why go through this charade that somehow we are really close friends, except when it comes to the really important things?

We have driven this country apart through the people's House, and we wonder what happened?

The biggest loss on November 3 was not by Donald Trump; it was the faith and trust that the American people lost in this voting system because we have allowed it to happen. It is unconstitutional.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, 80 years ago today, Franklin Roosevelt delivered his third inaugural address. "Every realist knows," he said, "that the democratic way of life at this moment is being directly assailed in every part of the world—assailed either by arms, or by the secret spreading of poisonous propaganda by those who would seek to destroy unity and promote discord in nations still at peace."

Today, the principal threat to our democracy comes from a different but

also poisonous propaganda of those who seek to destroy our unity and promote discord.

According to this propaganda, America cannot conduct a free or fair election. Our elections are rigged and doomed.

According to this propaganda, the voters can no longer decide who shall be President. The Congress must decide for them.

At a time when our Nation faces an unprecedented health crisis, with thousands dying every day, with Americans struggling to put food on the table and keep a roof over their head, who are we to say that the man America chose to lead us out of this calamity shall not take office?

The coronavirus will claim more American lives than all of the casualties in World War II. To meet that moment will require unity, not discord; will require an abiding faith in our country, in our democracy, in our government's ability to function and provide for the needs of its citizens.

The Members of this body cannot continue to challenge the merits of an election that was fairly conducted and overwhelmingly won by Joe Biden. It must stop.

Look at the damage that was wrought in this House today, to this country today. Is that not enough?

Roosevelt said: "This Nation has placed its destiny in the hands and heads and hearts of its millions of free men and women. . . . Our strength," he concluded "is our unity of purpose."

Let us unite once again in defense of the greatest hope of freedom-loving people around the world, this precious democracy.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, the baseless attack on Pennsylvania and its electors brought to mind, for me, the great Tom Paine, the champion of popular democracy, who came over to America to fight with us in the Revolution against the king. He lived in Philadelphia, where he wrote "Common Sense" and "The Age of Reason." And Paine said: In the monarchies, the king is the law; but in the democracies, the law will be king.

When you think about it, the peaceful transfer of power is the central condition of maintaining democracy under the rule of law. That is why the famous election of 1801 was such a big deal.

When John Adams relinquished the Presidency to his passionate adversary and lifelong friend Thomas Jefferson, it was the first peaceful transition of power between democracies in a democratic republic in the history of the world.

And he said, as he rode back to Massachusetts from Washington, Adams said that he did this because we are a government of laws and not of men. We will betray this principle if we trade a government of laws for a government of men or, even worse, a single man, or an impressionable and dangerous mob

intent on violent sedition and insurrection against our beloved democratic Republic.

Here is Abraham Lincoln right before the war. At what point, then, is the approach of danger to be expected? I would answer, if it ever reaches us, it must spring up amongst us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must, ourselves, be its author and its finisher.

Madam Speaker, my family suffered an unspeakable trauma on New Year's Eve a week ago. But mine was not the only family to suffer such terrible pain in 2020. Hundreds of thousands of families in America are still mourning their family members. Many families represented in the Congress are still mourning their family members who have been taken away from us by COVID-19, by the opioid crisis, by cancer, by gun violence, by the rising fatalities associated with the crisis in mental and emotional health.

Enough, my beloved colleagues. It is time for America to heal. It is time for our families and communities to come together. Let us stop pouring salt in the wounds of America for no reason at all. Let us start healing our beloved land and our wonderful people.

The SPEAKER. All time for debate has expired.

The question is, Shall the objection submitted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) be agreed to.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Members are reminded to vote when their group is called and to leave the Chamber after they have voted.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 138, nays 282, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]

YEAS—138

Aderholt	Cole	Green (TN)
Allen	Crawford	Greene (GA)
Arrington	Davidson	Griffith
Babin	DesJarlais	Guest
Baird	Diaz-Balart	Hagedorn
Banks	Donalds	Harris
Bentz	Duncan	Harshbarger
Bergman	Dunn	Hartzler
Rice (OK)	Estes	Hern
Higgs	Fallon	Herrell
Bishop (NC)	Fischbach	Hice (GA)
Boebert	Fitzgerald	Higgins (LA)
Bost	Fleischmann	Hudson
Brooks	Fox	Issa
Budd	Franklin, C.	Jackson
Burchett	Scott	Jacobs (NY)
Burgess	Fulcher	Johnson (LA)
Calvert	Gaetz	Johnson (OH)
Cammack	Garcia (CA)	Jordan
Carl	Gibbs	Joyce (PA)
Carter (GA)	Gimenez	Keller
Carter (TX)	Gohmert	Kelly (MS)
Cawthorn	Good (VA)	Kelly (PA)
Chabot	Gooden (TX)	Kustoff
Cline	Gosar	LaMalfa
Cloud	Graves (LA)	Lamborn
Clyde	Graves (MO)	Lesko

Long	Owens
Loudermilk	Palazzo
Lucas	Palmer
Luetkemeyer	Pence
Malliotakis	Perry
Mann	Pfleger
Mast	Posey
McCarthy	Reschenthaler
McClain	Rice (SC)
Meuser	Rogers (AL)
Miller (IL)	Rogers (KY)
Miller (WV)	Rose
Mooney	Rosendale
Moore (AL)	Rouzer
Mullin	Rutherford
Murphy (NC)	Scalise
Nehls	Schweikert
Norman	Sessions
Nunes	Smith (MO)
Obernolte	Smith (NE)

Adams	Espallat
Aguilar	Evans
Allred	Feenstra
Amodei	Ferguson
Armstrong	Fitzpatrick
Anchincloss	Fletcher
Axne	Fortenberry
Bacon	Poster
Balderson	Frankel, Lois
Barr	Fudge
Barragan	Gallagher
Bass	Gallego
Beatty	Garamendi
Bera	Garbarino
Beyer	Garcia (IL)
Bishop (GA)	Garcia (TX)
Blumenauer	Golden
Blunt Rochester	Gomez
Bonamici	Gonzales, Tony
Bourdeaux	Gonzalez (OH)
Bowman	Gonzalez,
Boyle, Brendan	Vicente
F.	Gottheimer
Brown	Green, Al (TX)
Brownley	Grijalva
Buchanan	Grothman
Bucshon	Guthrie
Bush	Haaland
Bustos	Harder (CA)
Butterfield	Hayes
Carbajal	Herrera Beutler
Cárdenas	Higgins (NY)
Carson	Hill
Cartwright	Himes
Case	Hinson
Casten	Hollingsworth
Castor (FL)	Horsford
Castro (TX)	Houlahan
Cheney	Hoyer
Chu	Huffman
Cicilline	Huizenga
Clark (MA)	Jackson Lee
Clarke (NY)	Jacobs (CA)
	Jayapal
	Jeffries
	Cohen
	Johnson (GA)
	Johnson (SD)
	Johnson (TX)
	Jones
	Correa
	Kahele
	Kaptur
	Katko
	Keating
	Kelly (IL)
	Khanna
	Kildee
	Killmer
	Kim (CA)
	Kim (NJ)
	Kind
	Kinziger
	Kirkpatrick
	Krishnamoorthi
	Kuster
	LaHood
	Lamb
	Langevin
	Larsen (WA)
	Larson (CT)
	Latta
	Lawrence
	Lawson (FL)
	Lee (CA)
	Lee (NV)
	Leger Fernandez
	Levin (CA)
	Levin (MI)

NAYS—282

Lieu	Smucker
Lofgren	Stefanik
Lowenthal	Steube
Luria	Stewart
Lynch	Thompson (PA)
Mace	Tiffany
Mallinowski	Timmons
Maloney,	Van Drew
Carolyn B.	Van Dyne
Maloney, Sean	Walberg
Manning	Walorski
Mastie	Weber (TX)
Matsui	Webster (FL)
McBath	Williams (TX)
McCauley	Wilson (SC)
McClintock	Witman
McCullum	Wright
McEachin	Zeldin
McGovern	
McHenry	
McKinley	
McNerney	
Meeks	
Meijer	
Meng	
Mfume	
Miller-Meeks	
Moolenaar	
Moore (UT)	
Moore (WI)	
Morelle	
Moulton	
M Ryan	
Murphy (FL)	
Nadler	
Napolitano	
Neal	
Neguse	
Newhouse	
Newman	
Norcross	
O'Halleran	
Ocasio-Cortez	
Omar	
Pallone	
Panetta	
Pappas	
Pascrell	
Payne	
Pelosi	
Perlmutter	
Peters	
Phillips	
Pingree	
Pocan	
Porter	
Pressley	
Price (NC)	
Quigley	
Raskin	
Reed	
Rice (NY)	
Richmond	
Rodgers (WA)	
Ross	
Roy	
Roybal-Allard	
Ruiz	
Ruppersberger	
Rush	
Ryan	
Sánchez	
Sarbanes	
Scanlon	
Schakowsky	
Schiff	
Schneider	

Schrader	Stevens	Vela
Schrier	Stivers	Velázquez
Scott (VA)	Strickland	Wagner
Scott, Austin	Suozzi	Waltz
Sewell	Swalwell	Wasserman
Sherman	Takano	Schultz
Sherrill	Taylor	Waters
Simpson	Thompson (CA)	Watson Coleman
Sires	Thompson (MS)	Welch
Slotkin	Titus	Westerman
Smith (NJ)	Tonko	Westerman
Smith (WA)	Torres (CA)	Wexton
Soto	Torres (NY)	Wild
Spanberger	Trahan	Williams (GA)
Spartz	Turner	Wilson (FL)
Speier	Underwood	Womack
Stanton	Upton	Yarmuth
Stauber	Vargas	Young
Steil	Veasey	

NOT VOTING—11

Bilirakis	Hastings	Steel
Brady	Joyce (OH)	Tlaib
Buck	LaTurner	Trone
Granger	Scott, David	

□ 0308

Ms. CLARKE of New York changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the objection was not agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will now notify the Senate of the action of the House, informing that body that the House is now ready to proceed in joint session with the further counting of the electoral vote for the President and Vice President.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Secretary of the Senate shall inform the House of Representatives that the Senate is ready to proceed in joint session with the further counting of the electoral votes for President and Vice President.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOYER was allowed to speak out of order.)

HONORING SHUWANZA GOFF

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, this would not be the time I would have chosen, but it may be the last time that we are in session before the new administration comes in.

We are losing an extraordinary young woman who has been with me for over a decade and who is our floor leader, our floor director. All of you know her. Her name is Shuwanza Goff, and she has been with me for a significant period of time.

Shuwanza is a wonderful person. And the problem with having wonderful, talented, good staff is that at an administration change, they steal your people. It is just a terrible thing that happens. Two of my staff, Shuwanza Goff and Mariel Saez, will be going to the administration as well, and I have asked the administration to please do not take any more of my people.

But Shuwanza Goff has just been extraordinary. Those of you who have dealt with her understand how bright she is.



That is the bad news, Madam Speaker, that they have taken her. But the good news is, she is going to be the administration's representative to the House of Representatives, so we are going to see a lot of Shuwanza. I am sure she will be talking to both of us on both sides of the aisle and urging us to vote one way or the other or getting us information or doing all sorts of things that we might ask her to do and that she would want to do for us.

I want to say, Madam Speaker, and I know you share my view, those of us who have had an opportunity to work closely with Shuwanza, I love Shuwanza Goff. She is just a wonderful spirit. She is smart. She knows the rules. She knows the floor. I think Mr. MCCARTHY's and Mr. SCALISE's staffs would say the same thing if I had given them any notice that we were going to do this, but I thought we had some time.

Shuwanza, I really do want to thank you, and we wish you the best of luck. We know you are not going far. I know we are going to see a lot of you, but we wish you great success in everything you do.

I tell my staff, Madam Speaker, that they can go off the payroll, but they cannot go off the staff.

God bless, Shuwanza, and good luck.

□ 0322

At 3:22 a.m., the Sergeant at Arms, Paul D. Irving, announced the Vice President and the Senate of the United States.

The Senate entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, headed by the Vice President and the Secretary of the Senate, the Members and officers of the House rising to receive them.

The Vice President took his seat as the Presiding Officer of the joint convention of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House occupying the chair on his left. Senators took seats to the right of the rostrum as prescribed by law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint session of Congress to count the electoral vote will resume. The tellers will take their chairs.

The two Houses retired to consider separately and decide upon the vote of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to which an objection has been filed.

The Secretary of the Senate will report the action of the Senate.

The Secretary of the Senate read the order of the Senate, as follows:

*Ordered*, That the Senate by a vote of 7 ayes to 92 nays rejects the objection to the electoral votes cast in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for Joseph R. Biden, Jr., for President and KAMALA D. HARRIS for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Clerk of the House will report the action of the House.

The Clerk of the House read the order of the House, as follows:

*Ordered*, That the House of Representatives rejects the objection to the electoral vote of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to the law, chapter 1 of title 3, United

States Code, because the two Houses have not sustained the objection, the original certificate submitted by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will be counted as provided therein.

The tellers will now record and announce the vote of the State of Rhode Island for President and Vice President in accordance with the action of the two Houses.

This certificate from Rhode Island, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate from an authority of that State purporting to appoint and ascertain electors.

Senator KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Rhode Island seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Joseph R. Biden, Jr., of the State of Delaware received 4 votes for President and KAMALA D. HARRIS of the State of California received 4 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of vote of the State of Rhode Island that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from South Carolina, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate from an authority of that State purporting to appoint and ascertain electors.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of South Carolina seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Donald J. Trump of the State of Florida received 9 votes for President and MICHAEL R. PENCE of the State of Indiana received 9 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of vote of the State of South Carolina that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from South Dakota, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate from an authority of that State purporting to appoint and ascertain electors.

Senator BLUNT. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of South Dakota seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Donald J. Trump of the State of Florida received 3 votes for President and MICHAEL R. PENCE of the State of Indiana received 3 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of vote of the State of South Dakota that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

□ 0330

The VICE PRESIDENT. This certificate from Tennessee, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of electoral vote from the State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate of an authority of that State purporting to appoint or ascertain electors.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Tennessee seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Donald J. Trump of the State of Florida received 11 votes for President and MICHAEL R. PENCE of the State of Indiana received 11 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of the vote of the State of Tennessee that the teller has verified as regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from Texas, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from the State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate of an authority of that State that purports to appoint or ascertain electors.

Senator KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Texas seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Donald J. Trump of the State of Florida received 38 votes for President and MICHAEL R. PENCE of the State of Indiana received 38 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of the vote of the State of Texas that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from Utah, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate of an authority from the State purporting to appoint or ascertain electors.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of ILLINOIS. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Utah seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Donald J. Trump of the State of Florida received 6 votes for President and MICHAEL R. PENCE of the State of Indiana received 6 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of the vote of the State of Utah



that the teller has verified to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from Vermont, the Parliamentarians have advised me, is the only certificate of vote from the State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate of an authority from that State purporting to appoint or ascertain electors.

Senator BLUNT. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Vermont seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Joseph R. Biden, Jr., of the State of Delaware received 3 votes for President and KAMALA D. HARRIS of the State of California received 3 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of the vote of the State of Vermont that the teller has verified as regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from the Commonwealth of Virginia, the Parliamentarians have advised, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate of an authority from that same State purporting to appoint or ascertain electors.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the Commonwealth of Virginia seems to be in regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Joseph R. Biden, Jr., of the State of Delaware received 13 votes for President and KAMALA D. HARRIS of the State of California received 13 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of the vote of the Commonwealth of Virginia that the teller has verified as appearing regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from Washington, the Parliamentarians have advised, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has a certificate of an authority from the same State purporting to appoint or ascertain electors.

Senator KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Washington seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Joseph R. Biden, Jr., of the State of Delaware received 12 votes for President and KAMALA D. HARRIS of the State of California received 12 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of the vote of the State of Washington that the teller has verified and appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from West Virginia, the Parliamentarians have advised, is the only certificate of vote from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate of an authority from the State purporting to appoint or ascertain electors.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of ILLINOIS. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of West Virginia seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Donald J. Trump of the State of Florida received 5 votes for President and MICHAEL R. PENCE of the State of Indiana received 5 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting the certificate of the vote for the State of West Virginia that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, this certificate from Wisconsin, the Parliamentarians have advised, is the only certificate from that State that purports to be a return from the State and that has annexed to it a certificate of an authority from the State purporting to appoint or ascertain electors.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Wisconsin seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Joseph R. Biden, Jr., of the State of Delaware received 10 votes for President and KAMALA D. HARRIS of the State of California received 10 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. President, I object to the electoral votes of the State of Wisconsin because 71 House Members, all of who condemn violence as we witnessed today, are firmly committed to the resolution of disagreements in civil, lawful, peaceful institutions with full and fair debate, free of violence. And though not a single court has allowed an evidentiary hearing to listen to the significant body of evidence of fraud, and though some seize on the court's failure to misrepresent that no court would listen to the evidence as saying evidence did not exist; while Democrat leaders in Milwaukee illegally and unconstitutionally created more than 200 illegal polling places; tens of thousands of votes were changed by workers, despite election workers' objections, plus so many other illegalities to fraudulently create a 20,000-vote lead, we object, along with a Senator who now has withdrawn his objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sections 15 and 17 of title 3 of the United States Code require that any objection be presented in writing, signed by a Member of the House of Representatives and a Senator.

Is the objection in writing and signed by a Member and a Senator?

Mr. GOHMERT. It is in writing. It is signed by a Member, but it is not signed and objected to by a Senator, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In that case, the objection cannot be entertained.

This certificate from Wyoming, the Parliamentarians have advised, is the only certificate of vote from that State and purports to be a return from the State and has annexed to it the certificate of an authority from the same State purporting to appoint or ascertain electors.

Senator BLUNT. Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Wyoming seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Donald J. Trump of the State of Florida received 3 votes for President and MICHAEL R. PENCE of the State of Indiana received 3 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any objections to counting a certificate of the vote of the State of Wyoming that the teller has verified appears to be regular in form and authentic?

There was no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing none, the Chair advises Members of Congress the certificates having been read, the tellers will ascertain and deliver the result to the President of the Senate.

Senator KLOBUCHAR. The undersigned, ROY BLUNT and AMY KLOBUCHAR, tellers on the part of the Senate; ZOE LOFGREN and RODNEY DAVIS, tellers on the part of the House of Representatives, report the following as the result of the ascertainment and counting of the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States for the term beginning on the 20th day of January, 2021. The report we make is that Joe Biden and KAMALA HARRIS will be the President and the Vice President, according to the ballots that have been given to us.

The tellers delivered to the President of the Senate the following statement of results:

JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS FOR THE COUNTING OF THE ELECTORAL VOTES FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—OFFICIAL TALLY

The undersigned, ROY BLUNT and AMY KLOBUCHAR tellers on the part of the Senate, ZOE LOFGREN and RODNEY DAVIS tellers on the part of the House of Representatives, report the following as the result of the ascertainment and counting of the electoral vote for President and Vice President of the United States for the term beginning on the twentieth day of January, two thousand and twenty one.

Electoral votes of each State	For President		For Vice President	
	Joseph R. Biden, Jr.	Donald J. Trump	Kamala D. Harris	Michael R. Pence
Alabama—9		9		9
Alaska—3		3		3
Arizona—11	11		11	
Arkansas—6		6		6



Electoral votes of each State	For President		For Vice President	
	Joseph R. Biden, Jr.	Donald J. Trump	Kamala D. Harris	Michael R. Pence
California—55	55		55	
Colorado—9	9		9	
Connecticut—7	7		7	
Delaware—3	3		3	
District of Columbia—3	3		3	
Florida—29		29		29
Georgia—16	16		16	
Hawaii—4	4		4	
Idaho—4		4		4
Illinois—20	20		20	
Indiana—11		11		11
Iowa—6	6		6	
Kansas—6	6		6	
Kentucky—8	8		8	
Louisiana—8		8		8
Maine—4	3	1	3	1
Maryland—10	10		10	
Massachusetts—11	11		11	
Michigan—16	16		16	
Minnesota—10	10		10	
Mississippi—6		6		6
Missouri—10		10		10
Montana—3		3		3
Nebraska—5	1	4	1	4
Nevada—6	6		6	
New Hampshire—4	4		4	
New Jersey—14	14		14	
New Mexico—5	5		5	
New York—29	29		29	
North Carolina—15		15		15
North Dakota—3		3		3
Ohio—18		18		18
Oklahoma—7		7		7
Oregon—7	7		7	
Pennsylvania—20	20		20	
Rhode Island—4	4		4	
South Carolina—9		9		9
South Dakota—3		3		3
Tennessee—11		11		11
Texas—38		38		38
Utah—6		6		6
Vermont—3	3		3	
Virginia—13	13		13	
Washington—12	12		12	
West Virginia—5		5		5
Wisconsin—10	10		10	
Wyoming—3		3		3
Total—538	306	232	306	232

ROY BLUNT,  
AMY KLOBUCHAR,  
*Tellers on the part of  
the Senate.*  
ZOE LOFGREN,  
RODNEY DAVIS,  
*Tellers on the part of  
the House of Rep-  
resentatives.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The state of the vote for President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of electors appointed to vote for President of the United States is 538. Within that whole number, a majority is 270.

The votes for President of the United States are as follows:

Joseph R. Biden, Jr., of the State of Delaware has received 306 votes.

Donald J. Trump of the State of Florida has received 232 votes.

The whole number of electors appointed to vote for Vice President of the United States is 538. Within that whole number, a majority is 270.

The votes for Vice President of the United States are as follows:

KAMALA D. HARRIS of the State of California has received 306 votes.

MICHAEL R. PENCE of the State of Indiana has received 232 votes.

This announcement of the state of the vote by the President of the Senate shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons elected President and Vice President of the United States, each for the term beginning on the 20th day of January, 2021, and shall be entered, together with the list of the votes, on the Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The Chair now recognizes for the purpose of a closing prayer the 62nd Chaplain of the United States Senate, Chaplain Barry C. Black.

□ 0340

Chaplain BLACK. Lord of our lives and sovereign of our beloved Nation, we deplore the desecration of the United States Capitol Building, the shedding of innocent blood, the loss of life, and the quagmire of dysfunction that threaten our democracy.

These tragedies have reminded us that words matter and that the power of life and death is in the tongue. We have been warned that eternal vigilance continues to be freedom's price.

Lord, You have helped us remember that we need to see in each other a common humanity that reflects Your image. You have strengthened our resolve to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies domestic, as well as foreign.

Use us to bring healing and unity to a hurting and divided Nation and world. Thank You for what You have blessed our lawmakers to accomplish in spite of threats to liberty.

Bless and keep us. Drive far from us all wrong desires, incline our hearts to do Your will, and guide our feet on the path of peace. And God bless America.

We pray in Your sovereign name.

Amen.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The purpose of the joint session having concluded, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, 117th Congress, the Chair declares the joint session dissolved.

(Thereupon, at 3 o'clock and 44 minutes a.m., the joint session of the two Houses of Congress was dissolved.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). Pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, the electoral vote will be spread at large upon the Journal.

## ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 5(a)(1)(B) of House Resolution 8, the House stands adjourned until 11 a.m. on Monday, January 11, 2021.

Thereupon (at 3 o'clock and 48 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 11, 2021, at 11 a.m.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CLOUD (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. PALMER, Mr. RUTHERFORD, and Mr. BAIRD):

H.R. 217. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enforce the licensure requirement for medical providers of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PFLUGER (for himself, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma, Mr. JACKSON, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. BABIN, Mr. ROY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. FALLON, and Mr. ARRINGTON):

H.R. 218. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture from issuing moratoriums on issuing new oil and gas leases and drill permits on certain Federal lands; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 219. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to exclude from eligibility for the generalized system of preferences any country that fails to effectively enforce its environmental laws or meet its international environmental obligations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EMMER (for himself and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 220. A bill to make supplemental appropriations to carry out farm stress programs, provide for expedited additional support under the farm and ranch stress assistance network, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 221. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to modify the oath of office taken by individuals in the civil service or uniformed services, and of other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself and Mr. McEACHIN):

H.R. 222. A bill to treat the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November in the same manner as any legal public holiday for purposes of Federal employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT (for himself and Mr. SRES):

H.R. 223. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to reimburse



qualified health care providers for the costs of purchasing, leasing, installing, and operating qualified equipment for cold storage of COVID-19 vaccines; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. GARCIA of Texas (for herself, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. BABIN, Mr. VELA, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. ROY, Mr. YEASEY, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, and Mr. GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 224. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5302 Galveston Road in Houston, Texas, as the "Vanessa Guillén Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 225. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to more comprehensively address the interstate transportation of firearms or ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 226. A bill to direct the United States Postal Service to designate a single, unique ZIP Code for Fairlawn, Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself and Mrs. HAYES):

H.R. 227. A bill to provide dedicated funding for the national infrastructure investment program and the capital investment grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H.R. 228. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2141 Ferry Street in Anderson, California, as the "Norma Connick Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 229. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit a candidate for election for Federal office from using amounts contributed to the candidate's campaign to make payments to vendors owned or controlled by the candidate or by an immediate family member of the candidate; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 230. A bill to prohibit the use of funds provided for the official travel expenses of Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the legislative branch for airline accommodations which are not coach-class accommodations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 231. A bill to prevent the enrichment of certain Government officers and employees or their families through Federal funds or contracting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 232. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require the President, Vice President, and Cabinet-level officers to release their tax returns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STEIL (for himself and Ms. DEAN):

H.R. 233. A bill to amend the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 to include fi-

nancial criminal activities associated with the facilitation of severe forms of trafficking in persons within the factors considered as indicia of serious and sustained efforts to eliminate severe forms of trafficking in persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 234. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to treat certain individuals who served in Vietnam as a member of the armed forces of the Republic of Korea as a veteran of the Armed Forces of the United States for purposes of the provision of health care by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. JEFFRIES, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. SUOZZI):

H.R. 235. A bill to authorize additional monies to the Public Housing Capital Fund of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H. Res. 20. A resolution expressing support for the goals and ideals of "National Hydrocephalus Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CLOUD:

H.R. 217.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17

"To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. PFLUGER:

H.R. 218.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 219.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States of America. The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 220.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 221.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of article VI of the Constitution. In *McCulloch v. Maryland*, 17 U.S. 316 (1819), the Supreme Court stated, "Yet he would be charged with insanity who should contend that the legislature might not

superadd to the oath directed by the Constitution such other oath of office as its wisdom might suggest."

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 222.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 223.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One of the United States Constitution, section 8, clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Ms. GARCIA of Texas:

H.R. 224.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7: [The Congress shall have Power . . .] To establish Post Offices and post Roads

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 225.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 226.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 227.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H.R. 228.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 229.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 230.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 231.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 232.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

By Mr. STEIL:

H.R. 233.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 234.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 235.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 28: Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. BANKS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. COLE, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 40: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. TORRES of New York, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 51: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 82: Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 97: Ms. WILD, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. EVANS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LIEU, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. BASS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. TRONE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. POCAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MENG, Mr. COOPER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. CHU, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BEYER, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. DEAN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 173: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

H.J. Res. 12: Mr. HERN, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. BURCHETT, and Mrs. WAGNER.